LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BS 1136 .B76 1873
Brodie, James, 1800-1878.
The true text of the Old
Testament

The True Text of the Old Testament

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
DEC 5 2003
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Revd John Eadie D.D.
from the author

THE TRUE TEXT

OF

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

WITH SOME REMARKS ON

THE LANGUAGE OF THE JEWS.

BY THE

REV. JAMES BRODIE, A.M.,

AUTHOR OF "THE ANTIQUITY AND NATURE OF MAN," "OUR PRESENT POSITION ON THE CHART OF TIME," ETC.

EDINBURGH:
JOHNSTONE, HUNTER, & CO.
MDCCCLXXIII.

CONTENTS.

THE TRUE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION, - - - - - - - ix

CHAPTER I.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AS COLLECTED AND REVISED BY EZRA, 1

CHAPTER II.

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE IN REFERENCE TO THE SEPTUAGINT AND TO THE PRESENT HEBREW TEXT, - - - 7

CHAPTER III.

THE GREEK AND HEBREW SCRIPTURES COMPARED, - - 16

CHAPTER IV.

THE GENEALOGIES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, - - 32

CHAPTER V.

THE GENEALOGIES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, - - 42

PAGE.

CHAPTER VI.

THE HISTORICAL OBJECTIONS TO THE HEBREW CHRONOLOGY DO NOT APPLY TO THAT OF THE SEPTUAGINT, - - 48

THE LANGUAGE OF THE JEWS.

CHAPTER I.

THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES WHICH REGULATE THE CHANGES THAT TAKE PLACE IN LANGUAGES, - - - - 57

CHAPTER II.

THE LANGUAGE OF ISRAEL PREVIOUS TO THE TIME OF NEHEMIAH, - - - - - - - 64

CHAPTER III.

OUTLINE HISTORY OF THE JEWS AFTER THEIR RETURN FROM BABYLON, - - - - - - - 69

CHAPTER IV.

THE EFFECT OF THE MEASURES INTRODUCED BY EZRA AND NEHEMIAH, - - - - - - - 77

CHAPTER V.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE JEWS IN THE DAYS OF OUR LORD, - 83

PAGE.

CHAPTER VI.

THE QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT MADE BY OUR LORD AND HIS APOSTLES WERE TAKEN FROM THE HEBREW, - - - - - - - - 91

CHAPTER VII.

THE PREVALENCE OF GREEK IN THE WESTERN PART OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.—OPINION OF M. MAX MULLER, - 99

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PREVALENCE OF GREEK IN PALESTINE.—ARGUMENTS OF DR ROBERTS, - - - - - - 103

CHAPTER IX.

THE GIFT OF TONGUES.—OPINION OF DR ROBERTS AND DEAN ALFORD, - - - - - - - 115

CONCLUSION, - - - - - - - - 123

THE TRUE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.

HAVING from early youth been accustomed to combine the study of Science with that of Scripture, and having found both pleasure and profit in so doing, we have often felt it a source of deep regret that theologians, in general, pay so little regard to scientific pursuits, and that many of our philosophers show so little reverence for the revelation of God.

These feelings were more especially called forth, when, after the publication of Sir C. Lyell's work on the "Antiquity of Man," it became evident that some of those who hold the highest rank in the estimation of the literary world, look on the results of modern research as altogether opposed to the testimony of the Mosaic record.

Considering it to be at once the privilege and the duty of every intelligent man to judge for himself, and to accept of no opinion as true until he is satisfied as

to the facts and arguments on which it rests, we determined, more carefully than we had ever done before, to investigate the subjects in debate, without any deference to antiquated prejudice on the one hand, or to philosophical hypothesis on the other.

Two subjects of inquiry presented themselves for consideration. In the first place, Are the conclusions to which geologists and physiologists have come in regard to the nature and antiquity of man, borne out by the facts and arguments which they have adduced? In the second place, Are the inferences drawn by biblical critics from the Old Testament Scriptures entitled to implicit belief?

Directing our attention to the first of these inquiries, we soon came to look on the facts and arguments adduced by geologists in opposition to the Mosaic narrative as very far from bearing out the assertions they so confidently founded upon them. We published the result of our investigations in a little work, "The Antiquity and Nature of Man, in Reply to Sir Charles Lyell." We have once and again solicited discussion, but have never got any to reply; and we have the satisfaction of observing that many of the arguments which at one time were most prominently brought forward by the assailants of the Scriptural statements are now passed over in silence.

The second of the inquiries proposed—Are the inferences drawn by biblical critics from the Old Testament

Scriptures entitled to implicit belief?—we found more difficult. It required a far wider range of research than we at first anticipated, and led to results so much at variance with some of our preconceived opinions, that reiterated examination, and long continued prayerful study, were required before we could come to a final decision.

The more prominent facts which these researches have brought to light, and the conclusions to which they have led, are embodied in the little volume now presented to the public.

CHAPTER I.

THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES AS COLLECTED AND REVISED BY EZRA.

THE Apostle tells us in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that "God, at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets;" but in regard to the manner in which the Lord made known His will to the inspired penmen we are not informed; and we look on conjectures respecting it as unprofitable and vain. Having, however, been told that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," we believe that the Old Testament Scriptures, as originally revealed to the Jews, were sent from heaven, and were entitled to the reverence that is due to the unerring counsel of Him who cannot lie.

When we proceed farther, and direct our inquiries into the evidence we have that the records we now venerate are an accurate transcript of the revelation originally made, we enter on an altogether different and much more difficult subject.

We are not informed as to the means employed during the earlier epochs of the Israelitish commonwealth

for the preservation of the sacred writings, and we have reason to suspect that they were not unfrequently treated with neglect. The account, for example, that is given of the finding of the Book of the Law in the house of the Lord, in the days of King Josiah, shows how forgetful the Israelites, at that time, had been of the inspired deposit which had been committed to their care. From this neglect defects and inaccuracies must no doubt have arisen, such as are now found in our New Testament manuscripts.

On their return from Babylon, and re-establishment in their native land, Ezra and his associates are represented as having collected, revised, and arranged the sacred writings, with a diligence and a fidelity that have claimed the admiration and gratitude of every succeeding age.

Some have supposed that in this undertaking they were guided by Divine inspiration, and entertain the idea, that not only the original writers, but the scribes employed in copying their manuscripts, were miraculously preserved from error. Dr Gaussen of Geneva, in his work on the "Canon of Scripture," advocates this opinion in the following terms:—

"What God in His wisdom, and in harmony with His other works, needed to do, for the constant and perfect preservation of the sacred oracles confided to His people—what all the faithful under the old covenant firmly believed He had done,—St Paul declares

that He has actually done, and informs us by what means. It was, he says, by means of the Jews; God Himself having confided to them for this end, under the invisible government of His providence, the sacred deposit of the Scriptures. It was thus that, by a sovereign and mysterious decree, He constituted this inconstant and wayward people the sure and faithful depositary of His Holy Word. 'Unto them were committed the oracles of God.'

"This important declaration is found at the beginning of the third chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. 'What advantage then hath the Jew?' The Apostle supposes an objector to say, 'What is his privilege, since, according to you, all men, Jews as well as Greeks, are under the condemnation of the Law?' This privilege is 'much every way,' he replies; 'but chiefly in this, that they were intrusted with the oracles of God.'

"Their privilege according to the Apostle is, then, not only that of possessing the Scriptures, which are the very oracles of God our Saviour; but especially that of having received them as a deposit, under the guardianship of God, and thus being divinely charged with their preservation.

"It is not said merely that the oracles had been *given* to them, as they have been to us, and to so many others, but that they were *intrusted* with them; so that this nation, though almost always rebellious, through the

long course of their history—this nation, 'always resisting the Holy Ghost,' as St Stephen said—this very nation, has shown itself constantly faithful for thirty-three centuries on this single point of the Scriptures; it has guarded them, and still guards them for ever unaltered."

Notwithstanding the deference that is due to an authority so distinguished as that of Dr Gaussen, we cannot concur in the opinion that the words quoted from the Apostle imply that the Jewish transcribers of the Law, down even to the present day, have been miraculously preserved from error.

St Paul is speaking of the advantages possessed by the Jews, and directs attention more especially to the inestimable privilege of having the oracles of God bestowed on them for their guidance in things pertaining to their spiritual welfare. We cannot look on his words as implying anything more than this; and we see no reason for believing that a special supernatural guidance has been vouchsafed, even to the modern transcribers of the Hebrew records, while no such aid has been granted to those who copied the writings of the Apostles.

We find no intimation in the Books of Ezra or Nehemiah that the scribes they employed were under the special direction of the Spirit; and we are not aware of anything in the writings of Josephus, or of any other Jew, that gives countenance to Dr Gaussen's conjecture. And we are not entitled to assume the miraculous interposition of the Spirit, when we have no intimation of such interposition having been made, and when we see no necessity for it.

While, however, we see no good reason for concluding that those who copied the volumes collated by Ezra were directed by supernatural influence, the anxious endeavour which was manifested by him and his associates to secure the accuracy of the writings committed to their charge, affords sufficient evidence that the canon they compiled was entitled to be regarded as the Word of the living God.

After the re-establishment of the Jewish commonwealth, the ordinance which directed the Law and the Prophets to be read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day, secured for the Scriptures far greater attention than had ever been paid to them before. A corresponding care, we may conclude, would also be shown in preparing the manuscripts in which they were contained.

The subsequent history of the Jews represents them as "zealous for the law," and distinguished for the scrupulous, we might almost say superstitious, reverence, which they paid to the written Word.

From various intimations which we find in the Gospel narratives, it is evident that this feeling continued unabated to the days of the Saviour, and we have every reason to believe that it remained un-

changed to the time when the city was laid waste by the armies of Rome.

These considerations are sufficient to show that the canon collated by Ezra, and preserved through the watchful care of the scribes, was entitled to thorough acceptation.

By far the strongest of all testimonies, however, that can be adduced in its favour, is the manner in which it was quoted by the Saviour himself. No one can refer to it with deeper reverence than He did; no one can show a more anxious desire to bow to the truth of every word that it contains, and submit implicitly to every injunction that it imposes.

The argument to which, above all others, He deferred, was, "It is written;" and nothing can show a more striking contrast to the flippant, presumptuous style in which some commentators permit themselves to speak of the fancied imperfections of the sacred Scriptures, than the deep and holy awe which our Lord exhibited towards His Father's word, "the Law and the Prophets."

It surely becomes sinful, ignorant men to manifest the deepest reverence for that Holy Book, to which Immanuel paid implicit submission.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE IN REFERENCE TO THE SEPTUAGINT AND PRESENT HEBREW TEXT.

HAVING in the preceding chapter endeavoured to point out the appropriate value of the canon collated by Ezra, we are, in the next place, led to an inquiry which is not only, like the former, of interest and importance, but is one that demands both careful and cautious research.

It is one, too, we must add, in regard to which many, as we think, have fallen into error.

The question is, "Where are we, at the present day, to look for the most reliable transcript, or version, of this precious volume?"

We have, in the first place, the present Hebrew text, in use among the modern Jews, from which the versions made by the Western Churches have been taken. We have, in the next place, the Septuagint, or old Greek translation, which was the only standard referred to by the early Christian authors, and which still continues to be considered as entitled to supreme authority by the Churches of the East. To which of these two is the preference to be given?

It has generally been assumed that the first of them is a faithful transcript of the original Hebrew; but we have no evidence to prove that it should be so esteemed. We have every reason for believing that the sacred Scriptures were preserved in Jerusalem, in their original integrity and purity, so long as the Mosaic polity continued; but there is strong ground for suspecting that these highly-prized treasures must all have perished in the destruction of the city.

While the Law and the Prophets were looked on with the deepest veneration by the Jews, they were regarded with very different feelings by their Roman invaders. They had been preserved with the most scrupulous care up to the time when the armies of Titus invaded Judea; but we have no reason for supposing that they passed unscathed through the disastrous epoch that thereafter ensued.

The Romans regarded the Jews with the most intense hatred and most sovereign contempt. The Latin poets treat their religious observances with ridicule and scorn. Tacitus speaks of them as "cherishing bitter enmity against all others," and describes their laws as "hostile to men, and calculated to inspire the Jew with hatred and opposition to the rest of mankind." And Cicero, pre-eminent as philosopher, legislator, and orator, seeks to justify the oppression with which they were treated, even when living as peaceable inhabitants of the provinces. He thus assigns his reason:—"While

Jerusalem kept its ground, and the Jews were in a peaceful state, their religious rites were repugnant to the splendour of this empire, the weight of our name, and the institutions of our ancestors; but they are most so now, because that race has shown by arms what were its feelings in regard to our supremacy; and how far it was dear to the immortal gods we have learned from the past, that it has been conquered, let out to hire, and enslaved."—*Oration for Flaccus*, c. 27.

When we call to mind the hatred with which the Jews were regarded, and the fury with which their exasperated enemies wreaked their vengeance upon everything that pertained to their peculiar religious service, we may rest assured that the records which had been treasured up in Jerusalem would be committed to the flames by their ruthless conquerors.

A similar fate would in all probability befall the volumes that had been preserved in the synagogues throughout the country. When the imperial legions spread over the land, previous to the final overthrow of the city, the inhabitants, instead of seeking safety in flight to other districts, crowded into Jerusalem, in the vain expectation that the Lord would there interpose miraculously on their behalf. By so doing they rushed madly on their own destruction; and it is not unreasonable to suppose that, buoyed up by the same fallacious hope, they took with them the treasures of their syna-

gogues, and that, by this means, these precious relics shared in the general ruin.

We must also recollect, that their records were altogether unlike the small and portable volumes of the present day. They were written on large rolls, which could neither be easily carried from place to place, nor easily hidden from the observation of an enemy. It is hardly possible, therefore, to suppose that the copies of the Law, from which the text at present in use among the Jews was taken, were those that were in use in Jerusalem, or even in Judea. The probability is, that they must have been brought from some of the more remote districts, on which the crushing weight of the oppressor did not so heavily fall.

Historical evidence in regard to the origin of the present Hebrew text is altogether awanting. We do not know who the parties were by whom the copies were made; we do not know where the originals had been preserved, nor the means employed to secure accuracy of transcription.

The fact, which has been noticed by Biblical critics, that the Syriac version agrees with the present Hebrew text, while all the other ancient versions, such as the Greek, the Arabic, and Samaritan, differ from it, but agree with each other, leads us to look to Syria as the source from which our modern copies of the Scriptures have been derived. But there are no means by which we can arrive at a definite conclusion on the subject.

We come, in the next place, to consider the claims which the Septuagint has to be regarded as an authority by the student of Scripture.

As we before remarked, it was the only standard referred to by the early Christian fathers, and still continues to hold the same position in the estimation of the Eastern Churches.

We are not ourselves acquainted with the works of the early commentators and historians, but we have the testimony of various learned critics, on whose statements we can fully rely, who give us good reason for placing the greatest confidence on the accuracy of the Septuagint.

Mr Hartwell Horne, in his "Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures," gives what may be regarded as an abstract of the conclusions to which previous inquirers had come. We shall enumerate, in order, his statements in regard to the Greek, or Alexandrian version.

The authority due to the Septuagint.—"Among the Greek versions of the Old Testament, the Alexandrian, or Septuagint, as it is usually termed, is the most valuable. It is uniformly cited by the early fathers, whether Greek or Latin, and from this version all the translations into other languages, which were anciently approved of by the Christian Church, were executed, with the exception of the Syriac."

The origin of the Septuagint.—"Much uncertainty has prevailed concerning the real history of this ancient

version. According to one account, Ptolemy Philadelphus, King of Egypt, caused the translation to be made for the use of the library which he had founded in Alexandria. For this purpose it is reported that he sent Aristeas and Andreas, two distinguished officers of his court, to Jerusalem, on an embassy to Eleazar, then high-priest of the Jews, to request a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures, and that there might also be sent to him seventy-two persons, who were equally well skilled in the Hebrew and Greek languages. These learned men were accordingly shut up in the Isle of Pharos, where, having agreed in the translation of each period, after a mutual conference, Demetrius wrote down their version as they dictated it to him, and thus, in the space of seventy-two days, the whole was accomplished. This relation is derived from a letter ascribed to Aristeas himself. If, as there is reason to believe is the case, this piece is a forgery, it was made at a very early period, for it was in existence in the time of Josephus, who has made use of it in his "Jewish Antiquities."

These ancient traditions, though evidently mixed with fable, give us every reason to conclude that the original copies of the Hebrew Scriptures, from which the Alexandrian version was taken, must have been collated with care, that the version taken from them was made with accuracy, and that it is, therefore, entitled to our confidence.

The Samaritan Pentateuch agrees with the Septuagint.

—"From the very close resemblance subsisting between the text of the Greek version and the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch, Louis Le Dieu, Selden, Whiston, Hessencamp, and Bauer, are of opinion that the author of the Alexandrian version made it from the Samaritan Pentateuch. And in proportion as these two correspond, the Greek differs from the Hebrew."—*Horne's Introd.*, vol. i., p. 175.

The translotions approved of by the Christian fathers agree with the Septuagint.—Mr Horne says, p. 171:—"From this version all the translations into other languages, which were anciently approved of by the Christian Church, were executed, with the exception of the Syriac, as the Armenian, Arabic, Ethiopic, Gothic, and Old Italic."

Mr Horne speaks of these versions as having been made from the Greek. This, in all probability, was true of the Gothic and Old Italic; but in regard to the Arabic, Ethiopic, and Armenian, the much more probable supposition is that they correspond to the Greek, not because they were translated from it, but because the original copies of the Scriptures from which they were taken, agreed with those that were employed by the Seventy.

Josephus adheres to the Septuagint.—"Salmasius, Bochart, Bauer, and others, have shown that Josephus has adhered to the Septuagint throughout his work on the 'Antiquities of the Jews.'"—*Horne*, i., 178.

Such are the testimonies borne to the Septuagint by Biblical critics. The opinion which they express in regard to the accuracy of the Jewish scribes who lived in the early part of the Christian era is very different.

Mr Horne says, p. 179:—"The Septuagint version retained its authority, even with the rulers of the Jewish synagogues, until the commencement of the first century after Christ, when the Jews, being unable to resist the arguments from prophecy which were urged against them by the Christians, in order to deprive them of the benefit of that authority, began to deny that it agreed with the Hebrew text. Farther to discredit the Septuagint, the Jews instituted a solemn fast, on the eighth day of the month Thebet, to execrate the memory of its having been made."

To the varied testimonies in favour of the Septuagint thus adduced by Mr Horne, there is yet another of a very different kind.

The quotations from the Old Testament Scriptures which we find in the New agree with the Septuagint.—This agreement is so remarkable, that all who have studied the subject concur in acknowledging it. It is thus described by the Rev. Professor Roberts, of St Andrews, in a Paper printed in the "Sunday at Home:"—"The quotations from the Old Testament, introduced by the Apostle into his discourse, Acts ii. 14, agree for the most part with the phraseology of the Septuagint, presenting only those slight variations, omissions, and

additions, which naturally occur in the case of one quoting from memory, and which are generally found in the citations made by the writers in the New Testament." He says of some other quotations from the Old Testament:—"Both seem manifestly borrowed from the Septuagint. They differ, no doubt, in several expressions which they contain from the precise words of the Seventy; but in so differing they do not approach nearer to the Hebrew." We regard the facts here stated by Dr Roberts as of the highest importance, though we are certainly very far from concurring with him in some of the inferences he deduces from them.

In so far as external evidences guide us—that is, in so far as agreement with other versions, with the words of Josephus, and with the quotations which we find in the New Testament, enable us to determine, we are led to give a very decided preference to the Greek translation.

We must be careful to keep in mind, that while we have thus the strongest corroborative testimony supporting the claims of the Septuagint, historical evidence in regard to the origin of the present Hebrew text is altogether awanting.

In coming to this conclusion, in regard to the superior authority due to the Septuagint, we are aware that we oppose a very generally received opinion. But we lay our arguments before the reader, and leave him to judge for himself.

CHAPTER III.

THE GREEK AND HEBREW SCRIPTURES COMPARED.

We, in the next place, compare the Greek and Hebrew versions together, that we may be the better able to judge of the discrepancies that are found between them, and form, from *internal* evidence, an opinion of their comparative accuracy.

We subjoin a list of all the passages, in the first thirty chapters of Genesis, in which any difference of importance is found.

We first give the translation we have taken from the Septuagint, and then the rendering from the Hebrew, as it is found in the English Bible.

Where the only difference consists in the omission of some words, which are found in the Greek but not in the Hebrew, these words are printed in italics.

BOOK OF GENESIS.

Chap. i. 9—"Let the water under the heaven be gathered together into one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. *And the water which was under the heaven was gathered together into its places, and the dry land appeared.*"

Ver. 11—"And God said, Let the earth bring forth the herb of grass bearing seed, according to its kind, and according to its likeness, and the fruit tree bearing fruit, whose seed is in itself, after its kind on the earth."

"And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth."

Ver. 14—"And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, *to give light upon the earth, and* to divide the day from the night."

Ver. 28—"And have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, *and all the cattle and all the earth*, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth."

Chap. ii. 2—"And on the sixth day God ended his work."

"And on the seventh day God ended his work."

Ver. 6—"But there rose a fountain out of the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground."

"But there went up a mist from the earth," etc.

Ver. 15—"And the Lord God took the man *whom he had formed*, and put him into the garden."

Chap. iii. 1—"Now the serpent was the most subtile of all the beasts of the field."

"Now that serpent," according to the literal rendering, "was more subtile than any beast of the field."

Ver. 12—"Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee, that *of it alone* thou shouldest not eat?"

Ver. 14—"Upon *thy breast and* thy belly shalt thou go."

CHAP. iv. 8—"And Cain said to Abel his brother, Let us go out into the field."

"And Cain talked with Abel his brother."

Ver. 12—"Thou shalt be groaning and trembling on the earth."

"A fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth."

CHAP. v. 3—The genealogies will be afterwards examined.

CHAP. vi. 16—"Thou shalt make the ark to contract, and in a cubit shalt thou finish it above."

"A window shalt thou make to the ark, and in a cubit shalt thou finish it above."

Ver. 19—"And *of all cattle, and of all creeping things, and of all wild beasts, even* of all flesh shalt thou bring, two and two, into the ark."

CHAP. vii. 1—"And the Lord *God* said unto Noah."

The omission of the word God from the title of Jehovah, as the Lord God, is of frequent occurrence.

Ver. 3—"And of fowls of the air *that are clean*, by sevens, *and of all fowls of the air that are not clean, by twos*, the male and the female."

Ver. 8—"Of fowls *that are clean, and of fowls that are not clean*, of clean beasts, and of beasts that are not clean, and of all that creepeth upon the earth, there went in two and two."

Ver. 17—"And the flood was forty days *and forty nights* upon the earth."

CHAP. viii. 1—"And God remembered Noah, and all the wild beasts, and all the cattle, and all the flying fowl, and all the creeping things, as many as were with him in the ark."

"And God remembered Noah, and every living thing, and all the cattle that were with him in the ark."

Ver. 13—"And it came to pass in the six hundred and first year *of the life of Noah.*"

Ver. 19—"And all the *wild* beasts, *and all the cattle*, and every bird, and whatsoever creepeth upon the earth, after their kinds, went forth out of the ark."

CHAP. ix. 1—"Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, *and have dominion over it.*"

Ver. 7—"Bring forth abundantly in the earth, and multiply therein, *and have dominion over it.*"

Ver. 9—"And I, behold, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you, and with every living creature that is with you, ... of all that come out of the ark."

"And I, behold, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you; and with every living creature that is with you, ... from all that go out of the ark, to every beast of the earth."

CHAP. x.—In the genealogies the accommodation of the Hebrew names to the Greek pronunciation makes it sometimes difficult to recognise their identity. In some

cases, other names seem to have been substituted for those that were found in the original Hebrew manuscripts. These we may suppose to have been the names by which the persons and places were known among the Greeks and Egyptians.

There is no other difference between the two lists, excepting in verses 22 and 24, to which we shall afterwards refer.

CHAP. xi. 8—"And they left off to build the city *and the tower.*"

Ver. 10—The genealogies will be afterwards considered.

Ver. 31—"And led them forth out of the land of the Chaldees."

"And went forth with them from Ur of the Chaldees."

A similar difference is found in chapter xv. 7.

Ver. 32—"And all the days of Terah *in the land of Canaan* were two hundred and five years."

CHAP. xiii. 1—"And Abram went . . . . . and Lot with him, into the wilderness."

"And Abram went and . . . . . Lot with him, into the south."

So also in verse 3.

Ver. 12—"And Lot dwelled in a neighbouring city."

"And Lot dwelled in the cities of the plain."

Ver. 17—"To thee will I give it, *and to thy seed for ever.*"

Ver. 18—"By the oak of Mamre."

"In the plain of Mamre."

So also in chap. xiv. 13, and chap. xviii. 1.

CHAP. xiv. 7—"The princes of Amalek."

"The country of the Amalekites."

Ver. 16—"All the goods *of Sodom.*"

Ver. 19—"And he blessed *Abram.*"

CHAP. xv. 2—"I am departing without a child, but the son of Masek, my home-born female slave, this Eliezer of Damascus. And Abram said, Since to me thou hast not given seed, one born in my house shall be mine heir."

"I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus. And Abram said, Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and, lo, one born in my house is mine heir."

Ver. 6—"And Abram believed God."

"And he believed in the Lord."

Ver. 11—"And when the fowls came down upon the carcases, even upon the divided parts of them, Abram sat down by them."

"And when the fowls came down upon the carcases, Abram drove them away."

Ver. 17—"And when the sun went down, there was a flame, and behold a smoking furnace and lamps of fire."

"And when the sun went down, and it was dark, behold a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp."

CHAP. xvi. 8—"And *the angel of the Lord* said to her, Hagar."

CHAP. xvii. 1—"And the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am thy God."

"And the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God."

Ver. 14—"And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised *on the eighth day.*"

Ver. 19—"And God said *to Abraham*, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son: and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, *to be a God* to him and to his seed after him."

Ver. 27—The concluding words of this verse, "were circumcised with him," are not in the Greek.

CHAP. xviii. 6—"And make cakes *upon the hearth.*"

Ver. 23—"Wilt thou destroy the righteous with the wicked? *And shall the righteous be as the wicked?*"

CHAP. xix. 10—"And shut to the door *of the house.*"

Ver. 15—"Arise, take thy wife, and thy two daughters, which are here, *and go forth.*"

Ver. 16—The Hebrew adds to the end of this verse, "and they brought him forth, and set him without the city."

Ver. 37—"And called his name Moab, *saying, he is of my father.*"

Ver. 38—"And called his name Ammon, *saying, the son of my family.*"

CHAP. xx. 2—"And Abraham said of Sarah his wife,

'She is my sister,' *for he feared to say she is my wife, lest at any time the men of the city should kill him for her sake;* and Abimelech king of Gerar sent, and took Sarah."

Ver. 14—"And Abimelech took *a thousand pieces of silver*, and sheep, and oxen, and men-servants, and maid-servants."

Ver. 16—"And unto Sarah he said, Behold I have given thy brother a thousand pieces of silver. These shall be to thee for the honour of thy countenance, and to all the women with thee—And, Speak the whole truth."

"And unto Sarah he said, Behold, I have given thy brother a thousand pieces of silver: behold, he is to thee a covering of the eyes, unto all that are with thee and with all other: thus was she reproved."

CHAP. xxi. 22—"And it came to pass at that time, that Abimelech, *and Ohozath his friend*, and Phicol the chief captain of his host."

There is a similar omission in verse 32.

CHAP. xxii. 2—"And get thee unto the high land."

"And get thee into the land of Moriah."

Ver. 12—"Thy beloved son."

"Thine only son."

There is the same difference in verse 16.

Ver. 13—"Caught in a plant of sabec."

"Caught in a thicket."

Ver. 14—"And Abraham called the name of that

place, 'The Lord hath seen:' that they might say to-day, In the mount the Lord was seen."

"And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-jireh (the Lord will be seen): as it is said to this day, In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen."

Ver. 17—"Thy seed shall possess the cities of the enemies."

"Thy seed shall possess the gates of their enemies."

So also in chapter xxiv. 60.

Chap. xxiii. 2—"And Sarah died in the city of Arba, *which is in the valley.*"

Ver. 9—"That he may give me the double cave, which he hath, which is in part of his field."

"That he may give me the cave of Machpelah (double), which he hath, which is in the end of his field."

A similar difference is found in verses 17 and 19, and in chapter xxv. 9.

Chap. xxiv. 7—"The Lord *the* God of heaven, *and the God of the earth.*"

Ver. 10—"And the servant took ten camels of his master's camels, and of all the goods of his master with him."

"And the servant took ten camels of the camels of his master, and departed; for all the goods of his master were in his hand."

Ver. 14—"Drink thou, and I will give thy camels drink, *until they shall have done drinking.*"

Ver. 22—"The man took golden ear-rings, each of a drachm weight."

"The man took a golden ear-ring of half a shekel weight."

The same difference is found in verses 30 and 47.

Ver. 43—"Behold I stand by the well of water, and the daughters of the men of the city come forth to draw water, and it shall be, that the virgin to whom I shall say."

"And let it come to pass, that the damsel to whom I shall say."

Ver. 44—"This shall be the wife, which the Lord hath prepared for his own servant Isaac."

"Let the same be the woman which the Lord hath appointed for my master's son."

Ver. 55—"And her brethren and her mother said."

"And her brother and her mother said."

Ver. 59—"So they sent forth Rebekah their sister and her goods."

"Rebekah their sister, and her nurse."

Chap. xxv. 18—"And he dwelt in the presence of all his brethren."

"And he died in the presence of all his brethren."

Ver. 25—"And the first came out red, hairy all over like a skin."

"And the first came out red, all over like a hairy garment."

CHAP. xxvi. 12—"And he received in the same year *barley* an hundredfold."

Ver. 14—"And he had cattle of sheep, and cattle of oxen, and many tilled lands."

"For he had possession of flocks, and possession of herds, and great store of servants."

Ver. 19—"In the valley *of Gerar*."

Ver. 24—"For the sake of Abraham thy father."

"For Abraham my servant's sake."

Ver. 25—"Isaac's servants digged a well *in the valley of Gerar*."

Ver. 32—"We have not found water," or rather, probably, "Have we not found water?"

"We have found water."

CHAP. xxvii. 6—"And Rebekah spake to Jacob, her *younger* son."

Ver. 29—"Be lord over thy brother, and let the sons of thy father bow down to thee."

"Be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee."

Ver. 38—"And *Isaac being troubled*, Esau lifted up his voice and wept."

Ver. 43—"And flee *to Mesopotamia*, to Laban my brother."

CHAP. xxviii. 3—"And may my God bless thee."

"And God Almighty bless thee."

Ver. 9—"To be his wife, *besides his other wives*."

Ver. 13—"*Fear not*, the land on which thou liest to thee will I give it."

Ver. 20—"If *the Lord* God will be with me."

CHAP. xxix. 1—"And Jacob went on his journey, and came into the land of the east, *to Laban the son of Bethuel, the Syrian, the brother of Rebekah, mother of Jacob and Esau*."

Ver. 9—"Rachel *the daughter of Laban*, came with her father's sheep."

Ver. 32—"And Leah conceived and bare a son *to Jacob*, and she said, The Lord hath looked on mine affliction, *and hath given me a son*."

Ver. 23—"And she conceived again, and bare a *second* son *to Jacob*."

CHAP. xxx. 5—"And Bilhah, *Rachel's maid*, conceived."

Ver. 11—"And Leah said, 'It is well,' and she called his name Gad."

"And Leah said, 'A troop cometh:' and she called his name Gad."

Ver. 18—"And she called his name Issachar, *that is Reward*."

Ver. 23—"And she conceived and bare *Jacob* a son, and *Rachel* said, God hath taken away my reproach."

PASSAGES FROM THE SECOND BOOK OF KINGS.

As it may be satisfactory to direct attention to some passages taken from another part of Scripture, we take,

ad aperturam libri, the first three chapters of the Second Book of Kings.

2 KINGS i. 2—"Inquire whether I shall recover of this disease; *and they went to inquire of him.*"

Ver. 3—"Is it because there is no God in Israel, that ye go to inquire of Baal-zebub, the God of Ekron? *But it is not so.*"

Ver. 4—"And Elijah departed, *and said to them.*"

Ver. 9—"And, behold, *Elijah* sat on the top of a hill."

Ver. 11—"And *the captain of fifty* spoke to him and said."

Ver. 12—"And fire came down out of heaven."

"And the fire of God came down from heaven."

Ver. 16—"And *Elijah* arose and went down."

Ver. 17—Instead of the notice given in the Hebrew of Jehoram, the Septuagint inserts the first three verses of the third chapter, with the addition, "and the wrath of the Lord was kindled against the house of Ahab." And repeats these three verses at the beginning of the third chapter.

CHAP. ii. 13—"And Elisha took up the mantle of Elijah, which fell off from him *upon Elisha.*"

Ver. 16—"Peradventure the Spirit of the Lord hath taken him up, and cast him *into Jordan*, or on some mountain."

"And *Elisha* said, Ye shall not send."

The name Elisha is in like manner omitted in several other places.

CHAP. iii. 7—"I will go up: *thou art as I am*, I am as thou art."

Ver. 19—"And ye shall smite every strong city."

"And ye shall smite every fenced city, and every choice city."

Ver. 21—"And all the Moabites heard that the *three* kings were come up."

Ver. 23—"And they said, This is *the* blood *of the sword.*"

Ver. 25—"And they stopped every well, and cut down every good tree, until they left only the stones of the wall cast down."

"And they stopped all the wells of water, and felled all the good trees: only in Kir-haraseth left they the stones thereof."

Ver. 27—"Then he took his eldest son, whom he had designed to reign in his stead, and offered him up for a burnt offering upon the wall. And great repentance came upon Israel: and they departed from him, and returned to their own land."

"And there was great indignation against Israel: and they departed from him, and returned to their own land."

In the inquiry which we have made into the discrepancies that are found between the Greek and the Hebrew, we have taken the English version as supplying an accurate translation of the Hebrew text. In

quoting from the Septuagint, while we have carefully examined the original, and given its meaning as clearly as we could, we have adopted the style and language of the English Bible, that our translation might not present an appearance of discrepancy where in reality there is none.

The investigation, which we have now made, refers only to a small portion of the sacred record. But it is sufficient to establish several conclusions of great importance.

In examining this list of discrepancies between the Greek and Hebrew, we find some that seem to have arisen from accidental errors in transcribing; there are others which appear to have been produced by differences of opinion in regard to the meaning of particular words and phrases, but by far the larger number are caused by the omission of words and sentences in the Hebrew, which are found in the Greek.

In general, the words omitted affect but slightly the meaning of the passages in which they occur. Whether, therefore, we regard the words found only in the Greek as additions made to the original record by the seventy translators, or as portions omitted by the Jewish transcribers, we cannot assign any fraudulent purpose, either to the transcribers of the Hebrew text, or to the compilers of the Septuagint.

If we look on these passages as additions made to the original, it is very evident that they are not additions

of such a nature as would naturally suggest themselves as emendations, or illustrations, of the text; and we cannot imagine any conceivable motive that could have induced the authors of the Septuagint to take such a liberty with the volumes intrusted to their care, as that supposition implies.

If, on the other hand, we regard them as omissions from the original record, they are exactly such alterations as we might naturally expect would be made by a company of transcribers, who, pressed for time in completing the heavy task set before them, took the liberty of striking out some words and sentences which they regarded as superfluous, or unimportant.

Judging from internal evidence, we are led to look on the Septuagint as a full and faithful translation of the volume collected by Ezra; while the present Hebrew text is an abridged, and consequently, in some respects, an inaccurate copy of the same original. At the same time, however, except in the passages that refer to genealogies, we find no really important difference between the two documents.

CHAPTER IV.

THE GENEALOGIES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A LARGE proportion of those who have written commentaries on the Old Testament seem to concur in the opinion of Dr Gaussen, and look on the Hebrew text as if the transcribers had been divinely inspired. We have already shown reasons for concluding that this is far from being the case. We find in it many inaccuracies, though in general the errors are of little importance, and do not indicate any deliberate design of falsifying the record.

We cannot say so much for the passages on which our computation of chronology depends.

The quotations we made from the work of Mr Hartwell Horne in reference to the Septuagint, contain several statements in regard to the Jewish chronologists, which show how little worthy they are of that implicit reliance which many writers have placed upon them.

We think it of importance, however, in a matter of such moment, to confirm his remarks by quoting the equally decided testimony of another witness, Dr W. Hales.

In his "Analysis of Chronology," he shows the diversity of statement in respect to dates that is found in different versions and copies, and expresses very decidedly his opinion in regard to it. The following are his words in reference to the Era of the Deluge:—

"EPOCH OF THE DELUGE.

"According to the Septuagint, - -	3246 B.C.
According to Josephus, - -	3146
According to the Samaritan, - -	2998
According to the Hebrew Text, -	2288
According to Vulgar Jewish Computation,	2104

"The variations of this important era, whence the history of the present race of mankind properly begins, are more mischievous and perplexing than those of the creation itself.

"The period of 480 years, from the Exodus to the foundation of Solomon's Temple, is also too short, and is plainly repugnant to the tenor of Scripture, as will appear from the detail of particulars.

"The same dishonest management appears in the details of the next period of 410 years, from the foundation to the destruction of the temple.

"The last supposed period of 40 years, from the finishing of the second temple, in the sixth of Darius Hystaspes, B.C. 516, to the era of contracts, B.C. 312, was in reality an interval of no less than 204 years. This is one of the most flagrant violations of chrono-

logical truth ever attempted even by the Jews themselves."

From these extracts it is evident that, in so far as its chronology is concerned, the accuracy of the present text, which comes to us through the medium of the Jewish transcribers, instead of being entitled to unhesitating confidence, is rather to be regarded with doubt.

PASSAGES CONTAINING GENEALOGICAL LISTS.

In quoting those passages of Scripture which contain the genealogical lists on which our systems of chronology depend, we shall imitate the style of the English Bible; but shall adopt the interpretation and dates that are given in the Septuagint. The spelling of the names is taken from the Hebrew.

When the numbers found in the Hebrew differ from those found in the Greek, we mark the Hebrew numbers in figures, and enclose them in brackets.

Genesis v. 3.

And Adam lived two hundred and thirty years [130], and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth: And the days of Adam after he had begotten Seth were seven hundred years [800]: and he begat sons and daughters: And all the days

that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died.

And Seth lived two hundred and five years [105], and begat Enos: And Seth lived after he begat Enos seven hundred and seven years [807], and begat sons and daughters: And all the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years: and he died.

And Enos lived one hundred and ninety years [90], and begat Cainan: And Enos lived after he begat Cainan seven hundred and fifteen years [815], and begat sons and daughters: And all the days of Enos were nine hundred and five years: and he died.

And Cainan lived one hundred and seventy years [70], and begat Mahalaleel: And Cainan lived after he begat Mahalaleel seven hundred and forty years [840], and begat sons and daughters: And all the days of Cainan were nine hundred and ten years: and he died.

And Mahalaleel lived one hundred sixty and five years [65], and begat Jared: And Mahalaleel lived after he begat Jared seven hundred and thirty years [830], and begat sons and daughters: And all the days of Mahalaleel were eight hundred ninety and five years: and he died.

And Jared lived one hundred sixty and two years, and he begat Enoch: And Jared lived after he begat Enoch eight hundred years, and begat sons and daughters: And all the days of Jared were nine hundred sixty and two years: and he died.

And Enoch lived one hundred sixty and five years [65], and begat Methuselah: And Enoch was well-pleasing to God after he begat Methuselah two hundred years [300], and begat sons and daughters: And all the days of Enoch were three hundred sixty and five years: And Enoch was well-pleasing to God: and he was not; for God took him.

And Methuselah lived an hundred sixty and seven years [187], and begat Lamech: And Methuselah lived after he begat Lamech eight hundred and two years [782], and begat sons and daughters: And all the days of Methuselah were nine hundred sixty and nine years: and he died.

And Lamech lived an hundred eighty and eight years [182], and begat a son: and he called his name Noah, saying, This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed. And Lamech lived after he begat Noah five hundred sixty and five years [595], and begat sons and daughters: And all the days of Lamech were seven hundred fifty and three years [777]: and he died.

And Noah was five hundred years old: and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth.

Genesis xi. 10.

These are the generations of Shem: Shem was an hundred years old when he begat Arphaxad, in the second year after the flood: And Shem lived after he

begat Arphaxad five hundred years, and begat sons and daughters: and he died.

And Arphaxad lived one hundred and thirty-five years [35], and begat Cainan. And Arphaxad lived after he begat Cainan four hundred years [403], and begat sons and daughters: and he died.

And Cainan lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat Salah. And Cainan lived after begetting Salah three hundred and thirty years, and begat sons and daughters: and he died.

And Salah lived an hundred and thirty years [30], and begat Eber: And Salah lived after he begat Eber three hundred and thirty years [403], and begat sons and daughters: and he died.

And Eber lived an hundred thirty and four years [34], and begat Peleg: And Eber lived after he begat Peleg two hundred and seventy years [430], and begat sons and daughters: and he died.

And Peleg lived an hundred and thirty years [30], and begat Reu: And Peleg lived after begetting Reu two hundred and nine years, and begat sons and daughters: and he died.

And Reu lived an hundred thirty and two years [32], and begat Serug: And Reu lived after begetting Serug two hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters: and he died.

And Serug lived an hundred and thirty years [30], and begat Nahor: And Serug lived after he begat

Nahor two hundred years, and begat sons and daughters: and he died.

And Nahor lived an hundred and seventy-nine years [29], and begat Terah: And Nahor lived after he begat Terah an hundred and twenty-five years [119], and begat sons and daughters: and he died.

And Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran.

Genesis x. 22.

In the Septuagint, in chapter x. 22, we have an enumeration of the children of Shem:—"The sons of Shem, Elam, and Assur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram, and Cainan."

This Cainan is omitted in the Hebrew.

In verse 24th it is said, "And Arphaxad begat Cainan; and Cainan begat Salah."

In the Hebrew, Cainan the son of Arphaxad is omitted.

1 Chronicles i.

In this passage, we find that part of it which refers to the immediate descendants of Noah in the 24th verse. According to the Hebrew text, "Shem, Arphaxad, Salah, Eber, Peleg, Reu, Serug, Nahor, Terah, Abram."

In the ordinary copies of the Septuagint six verses are omitted, and the record reads, Verse 17th, "The sons of Shem, Elam, and Asshur, and Arphaxad."

. . . . . Verse 24th, "Salah, Eber, Peleg, Reu, Serug, Nahor."

In the Alexandrine text of the Septuagint this omission is supplied; and in the 18th verse we read, "And Arphaxad begat Cainan; and Cainan begat Salah; and Salah begat Eber."

An examination into these discrepancies between the Septuagint and the Hebrew text leads us to some very important conclusions.

In the case of six of the antediluvian patriarchs, we find that an hundred years are taken from their earlier years; that is, from the period that elapsed before the birth of the son, through whom the descent of Noah is reckoned, and an equal amount is added to the account of their later years. By this means the full age of each individual remains the same in the Hebrew as in the Greek; but the period that elapsed between the creation and the flood is made to appear six hundred years less than the Septuagint represents it to have been.

In the lists of the postdiluvian patriarchs a similar process has been pursued. A century has been deducted from the younger years of six of them, a century and a-half are taken from those of Nahor, while the name of Cainan is entirely omitted. The time between the flood and the birth of Abraham is thus represented as having been only 292 years, while according to the Septuagint it was 1172 years.

We cannot regard these discrepancies as having

arisen from mere inadvertence, nor can we suppose that, like those to which we formerly directed attention, they proceeded simply from a desire to lighten the task of copying. On the contrary, we find in them manifest tokens of design.

The omission of the name of Cainan in the 22nd and 24th verses of the tenth chapter tends to confirm this supposition. This is the only instance of the omission of any name, which we have observed, in all the lists which are given in the thirty chapters which we before examined.

In endeavouring to discover the object which the fabricator of the alteration had in view we have nothing but conjecture to guide us, and uncertainty must consequently remain on our conclusions. We think, however, that a sufficient foundation for a probable explanation may be discovered.

If we accept the present Hebrew text as the authentic and accurate copy of the original, we can imagine no conceivable object that could have induced the Alexandrian translators to make a deliberate and systematic alteration on the record.

If we take the Greek to be a faithful rendering of the work completed by Ezra, and the Hebrew to have been fraudulently changed, we think we can discover an object, for accomplishing which a zealous Jewish partisan might have been induced to take liberties with the passages now under consideration.

The Jews seem to have had a kind of superstitious fondness for discovering a correspondence between the more remarkable events of their own national history and certain definite epochs of time. When we observe, therefore, that by adopting the reckoning of the present Hebrew text, the calling of Abraham, which may be regarded as the commencement of the Mosaic dispensation and the origin of the Israelitish commonwealth, is made to correspond with the two thousandth year of man's existence upon earth, we are led to suspect that the alteration must have been made by some unscrupulous Jew, who sought by this means to gratify the national pride of his countrymen.

This is merely a conjecture, but it has sufficient foundation to give it some measure of probability.

CHAPTER V.

THE GENEALOGIES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In the New Testament we have two genealogies given of our Saviour; one in Matthew, and the other in Luke. In Matthew, our Lord's descent is only traced to Abraham, while in Luke it is carried up to Adam.

The evangelist gives no record of dates or ages, but we find his list of names perfectly corresponding to those contained in the Septuagint, while it differs from those contained in the present Hebrew text in retaining the name of Cainan, the son of Arphaxad, which the Hebrew copyists seem to have taken such pains to remove.

To those who look on the evangelist as acting under the inspiration of God, this is a fact of the utmost importance, and strongly confirms the authority of the Grecian record.

There are some, no doubt, who argue against the admission of the name. Dr Lightfoot, whose high repute for learning and research compels us to take notice of his observations, speaks of the passage that refers to Cainan in the following terms:—

"I cannot be persuaded by any arguments, that this passage concerning Cainan was in Moses' text; partly, because no reason can be given how it should come to be left out of the Hebrew text, and partly, because nothing was more usual with the Greek translators than to add something of their own, according to their own will and pleasure.

"But if this version be so uncertain, and differs so much from the original, how comes it to pass that the evangelists and apostles should follow it so exactly, even in some places where it does so widely differ from the Hebrew fountain?

"*Answer.*—Whereas the New Testament was to be written in Greek, and come into the hands chiefly of the Gentiles, it was most agreeable, I may say necessary, for them to follow the Greek copies, as being what the Gentiles were only capable of consulting, that so they, examining the histories and quotations that were brought out of the Old Testament, might find them agreeing with and not contradicting them. For instance, they, on consulting their Greek Bibles, from David backward to Adam, find there Cainan, the son of Arphaxad. If Luke had not also inserted it, how readily might they have called his veracity in question as to the other part of the genealogy, which had been extracted out of registers not so familiarly known."

In this extract Dr Lightfoot falls, as we conceive, into two mistakes. He supposes, in the first place, that

the present Hebrew text is a full and accurate copy of the canon prepared by Ezra. We think we have shown that this is not the case. He assumes, in the next place, that the Jews, in the days of our Lord, had laid aside their Hebrew records, and adopted the Septuagint in their stead. For this there is no evidence, and we hope afterwards to be able to show that this also is an error.

But even if we were prepared to allow all this, and if we were to suppose yet farther, that the apostles, when speaking to their countrymen, quoted the Greek rather than the Hebrew, that could never account for the evangelist, when writing a history designed for all nations and ages, inserting the name of Cainan in his genealogy if he believed it to be fictitious. Such a supposition, in regard to one who was guided by inspiration from on high, savours of profanity. We cannot receive that part of the genealogy of our Lord which makes mention of Cainan the son of Arphaxad as an inaccurate statement, which the evangelist adopted out of deference to the prejudices of those who made use of the Greek translation. We accept it as a simple truth, recorded originally by Moses, and confirmed to the evangelist by the Holy Spirit of God.

If to the various other arguments which we have adduced in favour of the Septuagint, we add the concurring genealogy of Luke, there can remain no doubt as to the accuracy of its chronological statements, and

there need be no hesitation in denouncing those that are found in the present Hebrew text as wilful fabrications.

CONCLUSION OF OUR INQUIRY.

We have now completed our examination of those questions, an inquiry into which we considered necessary, in order that we might rightly ascertain the True Text of the Old Testament, and the Exact Chronology of Moses.

In our first chapter, we directed attention to the canon of the Old Testament, and while we found that we could not concur in the opinion of those who believe that they who collated, and they who transcribed, the Old Testament Scriptures, were equally under the inspiration of God, as those who at first received them, we found abundant evidence, in the anxious endeavour manifested by Ezra and his associates to secure the accuracy of the writings committed to their charge, that the volume they compiled is entitled to be relied on as the Word of the living God.

We more especially observed, that we have the strongest of all testimonies that can be adduced in its favour, in the uniformly reverential manner in which the Old Testament Scriptures are quoted by our Lord as the appointed rule of faith and of practice.

In the second and third chapters we took up the question: Where are we at the present day to look for the most accurate copy, or version, of the canon compiled by Ezra? After carefully examining the subject, judging, in the first place, by what may be called the external, and, in the next place, by what may be regarded as the internal evidence, we came to the conclusion, that the Septuagint is a full and faithful translation of the original volume, while the present Hebrew text is an abridged, and consequently, in some respects, an inaccurate copy of the same.

If this conclusion be correct, it shows that all our modern translations of the Old Testament require a full and careful revision.

In our third and fourth chapters, we took up the genealogical lists both of the Old Testament and of the New, and, after careful examination, were led to look on the Septuagint as a faithful translation of the Mosaic original, while the statements in the present Hebrew text are altogether unworthy of confidence.

The result of this part of our inquiry seems to be of great importance. It points out the true chronology of Scripture. It removes that doubt and uncertainty on the subject which emboldens the opponents of our faith to treat the histories of the Bible with scorn, and which leads some truly devoted men to regard the whole subject as a matter of but little importance. It takes away that feeling of perplexity which the reflecting

reader cannot help entertaining, when he finds reference made to comparatively large populations in the days of Abraham, who lived nearly twelve hundred years after the flood, but whose era is represented by modern computation as having commenced less than three hundred years after that event.

These are the conclusions to which our inquiry has led. We have found that inquiry much wider in its scope, and much more difficult in its execution, than we at first expected. We desire, therefore, to speak with caution and reserve. But truth demands the frank and honest statement of the results to which our researches have led.

CHAPTER VI.

THE HISTORICAL OBJECTIONS TO THE HEBREW CHRONOLOGY DO NOT APPLY TO THAT OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

THE arguments which we have hitherto adduced have all been of a purely literary kind. We have avoided introducing any allusion to preconceived theories of chronology. Our primary object was to determine by critical argument, what version of the Old Testament Scriptures was more especially entitled to our regard.

The importance of accurately determining the relation which the chronology of Scripture bears to the narratives and traditions of the heathen, will readily be allowed by all who take into account the attacks that at present are made on the sacred record by sceptical writers. Another and equally weighty consideration is found in the conduct of other authors, some of them eminently Christian men, who seem prepared to treat its details with very little regard.

Among them we regret to reckon his Grace the Duke of Argyle, who thus writes in his work on "Primeval Man:"—

"When the great figure of Abraham appears upon

the scene, we find ourselves already in the presence of the monarchy of Egypt, and of the advanced civilisation of the Pharaohs. In the same narrative we find ourselves on another side, in contact also with one of those great military kingdoms of the East, which in succession occupy so large a space in the history of the ancient world. Chedorlaomer, with his tributary princes, was then the ruler of nations capable of waging wars of conquest at vast distances from the seat of their government and the centre of their power. We see in him, therefore, the sovereign of a long established and powerful race.

"We have other evidence of an historical character to show that the monarchy of Egypt had been founded long before the time of Abraham. But how long is a question on which there is the widest discrepancy of opinion. The most moderate computation carries the foundation of that monarchy as far back as 700 years before the visit of the Hebrew patriarch. Some of the best German scholars hold that there is evidence of a much longer chronology. But seven centuries before Abraham is the estimate of Mr R. Stuart Poole, of the British Museum, who is one of the very highest authorities, and certainly one of the most cautious upon questions of Egyptian chronology. This places the beginning of the Pharaohs in the twenty-eighth century B.C. But according to Usher's interpretation of the Hebrew Pentateuch, the twenty-eighth century B.C.

would be some 400 years before the flood. On the other hand, a difference of 800 years is allowed by the chronology which is founded on the Septuagint version of the Scriptures. But the fact of this difference tells in two ways. A margin of variation amounting to eight centuries between two versions of the same document, is a variation so enormous, that it seems to cast complete doubt on the whole system of interpretation on which such computations of time are based. And yet it is more than questionable whether it is possible to reconcile the known order of events with even this larger estimate of the number of years. It is true that, according to this larger estimate, the flood would be carried back about four and a-half centuries beyond the beginning of the Pharaohs. But is this enough? The founding of a monarchy is not the beginning of a race. The people among whom such monarchies arose must have grown and gathered during many generations. Nor is it in regard to the people of Egypt alone that this difficulty meets us in the face. The existence, in the days of Abraham, of such an organised government as that of Chedorlaomer, shows that, 2000 years B.C., there flourished in Elam, beyond Mesopotamia, a nation which even now would be ranked among 'The Great Powers.'

"There is another civilisation which appears to have been almost as ancient as that of Egypt, and which has been far more enduring. The authentic records of the

Chinese Empire are said to begin in the twenty-fourth century B.C., that is more than 300 years before the time of Abraham. They begin, too, apparently with a kingdom already established, with a capital city, and with a settled government."

If we adopt the ordinarily received Hebrew text as an authentic and accurate record, the arguments here adduced may well lead us to look on the whole system of Scripture chronology as enveloped in perplexity and doubt. If there were only two hundred and ninety-two years between the flood and the birth of Abraham, we find it impossible to account for the numbers of people who seem, from the statements contained in the Bible narrative, to have inhabited the earth in the days of the patriarch. The early records of Egypt and China, though we cannot place implicit confidence upon them, afford a farther evidence of the increase of mankind, and add to the difficulty of reconciling the historical traditions of former ages with the ordinary computation.

But if we adopt the rendering of the Septuagint, which, as we have shown, there is good ground for preferring, all our difficulties vanish, and ample time is afforded for the multiplication of mankind previous to the arrival of Abraham in Egypt.

We must farther remark, that the Hebrew narrative speaks of men in the ages that immediately followed the flood as possessing a vigour of constitution much greater than that which is now allotted to our race.

Their lives were prolonged far beyond the span assigned to us at present. The constant reference that is made to their having "sons and daughters," leads us to believe that a remarkable fruitfulness also distinguished them. We can easily suppose, therefore, that in a period of eleven hundred and seventy-two years mankind would have greatly increased and spread themselves abroad over the earth.

If we adopt the chronology of the Septuagint, and keep the peculiar circumstances referred to by the sacred historian in our remembrance, we find a perfect agreement among all the ancient historians, whether sacred or profane.

With some of the suppositions that are made by his Grace in the extracts we have given from his work, we cannot concur.

If the people among whom such monarchies as those of Egypt and China arose, "*must* have grown and gathered during many generations," how came it to pass that the Roman empire, the greatest that the world has ever seen, and which dated all it records from the founding of the city, originated in a little company of young men, who, as their own historians tell us, were regarded by their neighbours as "robbers and semi-barbarians"?

His Grace speaks of "the advanced civilisation of the Pharaohs;" but the Scripture account of Abraham's visit to Egypt does not give us a very high opinion of

the culture and refinement to which they had attained in the days of the patriarch.

As for Chedorlaomer, while we are informed of his widely extended plundering incursions, we are at the same time told that the inhabitants of the valley of Sodom were not afraid to meet him in battle array.

That valley, even if we were to suppose that it occupied the whole space now covered by the waters of the Dead Sea, was only sixty miles in length, by from eight to ten in breadth. The description given of it in the thirteenth chapter of Genesis represents it as a pastoral district, "well watered every where;" and it was so thinly peopled that Lot found ample room for his numerous flocks and herds. The army, therefore, that defied the bands of Chedorlaomer, and went out to meet him in the open field, must have been but small. They were, no doubt, defeated; but the invader, in his turn, was utterly routed by Abraham and his little band of household retainers—three hundred and eighteen in all, —with whom his neighbours, Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre, did not hesitate to join in the pursuit of the confederate kings.

Chedorlaomer and his associates, in short, must be regarded as a mere band of marauders; and certainly we never could speak of them as "a nation which even now would be ranked among the great powers."

If, on the one hand, we adopt the chronology of the Septuagint, which we think we have proved to be that

on which we can most confidently rely, and if, on the other hand, we examine the events which occurred in the early history of mankind with the calm and unbiassed scrutiny of reason, we will find no difficulty in repelling the historical objections that have been brought against the chronology of Scripture.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE JEWS.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE JEWS.

CHAPTER I.

THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES WHICH REGULATE THE CHANGES THAT TAKE PLACE IN LANGUAGES.

Before we begin our investigation into the language spoken by the Jews, and into the changes which it is supposed to have undergone, it will be of some advantage to direct attention to the general principles that regulate the changes which take place in other languages, as these alterations are exemplified in the history of those dialects which we can more easily examine.

Every variety of speech may be regarded in three different aspects. It may be regarded simply as a collection of words, to which men have agreed to give an arbitrary meaning, and which are made use of by the inhabitants of some particular country or district. It may be looked on as a combination of words, regulated by the laws of syntax and idiom, which the custom of different nationalities has sanctioned. And yet, again, it may be looked on as a collection of articulate sounds,

some of which are common to a great many dialects, while others are peculiar, and characteristic of a few. In all these respects languages are liable to change. New words are introduced into the vocabulary, while others become obsolete, and are forgotten. New idioms become fashionable, and old forms of expression are cast aside. There are alterations also in the characteristic pronunciation of different dialects, though these are comparatively few.

In general, men adhere with remarkable tenacity to the speech of their forefathers, and the circumstances that either retard or promote alterations can easily be pointed out. We shall state a few leading facts:—

I. When a people are by any circumstance, whether of locality or political position, shut out from frequent intercourse with their neighbours, their language undergoes in general very little alteration; but when these circumstances no longer operate, the case is very different. In many of the sequestered Highland glens of Scotland, where the inhabitants continued from father to son in their old-fashioned pastoral and agricultural avocations, the Gaelic continued for ages to reign supreme. But when intercourse had been opened up with the Lowlands, and the advantages to be derived from speaking English became manifest, a remarkable change took place; and several localities can be pointed out where nothing but Gaelic was heard some eighty or ninety years ago, and where nothing but English is

spoken now. The language of their forefathers is understood by the aged, but to their children it is as a foreign tongue.

II. The intermixture of races is the most fruitful source of linguistic change. It needs, however, a very thorough intermixture, and a very decided predominance in the one population over the other, to make that change speedy or extensive. Some countries remain bilingual, as it has been termed, for ages. In many districts of the Scottish Highlands, English and Gaelic continue both to be spoken, and a similar remark might be made in regard to English and Welsh in Wales; in regard to English and Irish in Ireland; and English and Old Norman French in the Channel Islands.

The history of modern English affords one of the most striking instances of the persistency with which nations continue in the use of the paternal tongue. When England was conquered by the Normans, the conquerors continued the use of French. They made it the language of the Court, of fashion, and of law. But the Saxons, who constituted the great bulk of the population, refused to conform. This bilingual condition of the country continued for many generations, but the effects which it produced on the language were much less than we might have expected.

After the connection between the Crown of England and the Norman provinces of France had ceased, and

after our nobles had begun to pride themselves in the name of Englishmen, the Saxon, in its modified form, was adopted as the language of Britain. The effects produced upon it, by the long continuance of the Norman supremacy, were unquestionably great. The language of the present day is not the Saxon of Alfred. Many foreign expressions have been introduced. Great alterations have been made; but when we trace the origin from whence our words are derived, we find all the vocables in most common use—the pronouns, prepositions, and auxiliary verbs, for instance, all that constitute what we may call the bone and muscle of the language—are derived from the Saxon. A writer in the "Weekly Review," June 8th, 1872, says—"Gray's 'Elegy in a Country Churchyard' contains 994 words, of which 821 are derived from the Anglo-Saxon, 125 from the Latin, 15 from the French, 7 from the Italian, and 23 from the Greek."

If we examine the characteristic pronunciation of the French, we find, that of all the peculiar consonants, vowels, and accents, which form such a marked distinction between the speech of the French and that of their Teutonic neighbours, the English have not adopted so much as one; while the only sounds made use of in the Saxon, which have been set aside in English, are the aspirate gutturals *kh* and *gh*, and these have only fallen into disuse within a comparatively recent time.

When successful invasion takes place, and the conquerors form a majority of the population, we commonly find that the aborigines adopt the language of the victors, and disuse their own. This has been the case in almost all the colonial settlements of the British.

Where the vanquished constitute the larger part of the population, and an intimate intermixture of the races takes place, we find, in general, that the vocables of the more numerous party are adopted, while changes more or less remarkable are made upon them, in order to accommodate them to the peculiar pronunciation of the victors. In examining modern Italian, for instance, we find the great mass of the words are of Latin origin; but changes are made upon them which show that they must have been adopted by men who were unable to pronounce some of the letters peculiar to the Latin. In French we find still greater alterations made, and evidently for a similar reason.

III. Where no intimate intermixture of races has taken place, changes in language proceed very slowly. A foreign language may become fashionable, as French was at the British Court in former times. It may be the language of learning and science, as Greek and Latin have been, and in a great measure continue to be, in our learned associations; but, after all, it may be very far from being the language of the people.

IV. The most effectual means of preserving a language from change is the formation of a national literature.

The Anglo-Saxon, in the middle ages, underwent many changes, though they do not appear to have been rapid.

On the revival of art and learning, and the consequent spread of civilisation, an accelerated movement began. There is a wide difference between the English of Chaucer and that of those who went before him; and there are equally wide divergencies between the style of the "Canterbury Tales" and that of Spencer and Shakespeare. So rapid was the transition which then began, that some of the writers of the Elizabethan age express an apprehension that, in order to secure permanent reputation, English would require to be set aside, and authors would need to have recourse to the ancient classic tongues. Waller, who was one of those whose writings tended to correct the imperfection which he laments, says in one of his poems:—

> "But who can hope his lines should long
> Last in a daily changing tongue?
> While they are new, envy prevails,
> And as that dies our language fails.
> Poets that lasting marble seek
> Must carve in Latin or in Greek;
> We write in sand, our language grows,
> And, like the tide, our work o'erflows."

In consequence, however, of the popularity of Shakespeare and other writers of that time, and more especially, in consequence of the publication of the authorised version of the English Bible, and its wide diffusion

through the community, the tendency to change was checked, and our national speech remains at present essentially the same as it was three hundred years ago.

Similar examples might be brought forward from other languages, but they are unnecessary, as few will be inclined to call in question the influence of a generally acknowledged standard of literary composition in preserving the national tongue from decay.

Some may look on this dissertation on the general principles which regulate the changes that take place in languages as unnecessary and out of place, and we acknowledge that there is ground for such an opinion. But we introduce it as affording the readiest means of replying to the rash conjectures, and bold, unfounded assertions, which we find brought forward in reference to the language of the Jews.

CHAPTER II.

THE LANGUAGE OF ISRAEL PREVIOUS TO THE TIME OF NEHEMIAH.

We do not stop to inquire into the changes which the language of Israel underwent previous to the exodus from Egypt. We may learn from a critical study of the Pentateuch what it was at that time. And in examining the Old Testament Scriptures, we have abundant means of tracing its subsequent course, down to the period when Nehemiah re-established the Jewish commonwealth.

During all that lengthened series of ages the national speech remained essentially the same. Some words once common may have become obsolete, and new ones may have been introduced into their place. In one place, for example, we read, "He that is now called a prophet, was beforetime called a seer." These changes, however, were very few. The Hebrew of Joshua and Moses is the Hebrew of Nehemiah and Malachi.

This persistent continuance in maintaining their national speech without alteration is altogether singular. We find nothing similar to it in the history of other races. At the same time, it is simply the natural result of the peculiar regulations under which the Lord had placed His people. They were all descended from the same father; they had all experienced the same vicissitudes in Egypt and in the wilderness; they were enjoined to look on each other as brethren; to keep themselves separate from the nations around; to avoid as a heinous offence against God, any intermarriage with their neighbours, and to remember that they were called on to be holy and peculiar, devoted to the Lord. All the circumstances which can favour the preservation of the national tongue unpolluted, concurred in resisting the corruption of the Hebrew.

In addition to the influence of these circumstances, we must remember that the reading of the law given by Moses; the revelations made from age to age through the prophets; the psalms and hymns that were sung in the sanctuary, must have produced an effect on the public mind very similar to that which our national literature has produced upon us.

We know from what history tells us of the word *Shibboleth*, that there were diversities of pronunciation among the different tribes. But the distinction that separated the Ephraimites from the Gileadites was precisely similar to that which separates the natives of London or of Northumberland from the inhabitants

of the rest of the kingdom. It was a peculiarity of pronunciation that did not indicate a departure from the national speech.

From 2 Kings xviii. 26, we learn that the educated classes in the days of Hezekiah were acquainted with the Chaldaic; but that the "Jews' language" was altogether distinct.

Part of Daniel, from chapter i. 4, to chapter viii. 1, is written in Chaldaic; and part of Ezra, from chapter iv. 8, to chapter vii. 27, is also written in it. There is, however, no amalgamation of the two languages. The Chaldaic stands out as distinct from the Hebrew as a quotation from a French or German author does in the pages of an English book.

The Hebrew and Chaldaic, though entitled to be regarded as cognate dialects, were at the same time distinct and separate.

The diversity that existed between them is shown by the account that is given in the Book of Daniel, of the pains that were taken in teaching the young captives that had been brought from Judea, "the learning and tongue of the Chaldeans."

Some quotations made by Walton in his "Prolegomena," lead us to conclude that the distinction between the Hebrew and the Chaldaic was more remarkable in pronunciation than in vocables. We copy Walton's words:—

"Oleaster says, 'I can easily believe that these two

languages were one and the same at the beginning, since they are now so closely related.'

"Lucas Brugensis says, 'It is possible for one who has been instructed in the rudiments of Hebrew, to learn as much of the Chaldaic and Syriac in the space of two months as is necessary for a theologian to know.'

"This opinion," says Walton, "the experience of all who have bestowed moderate diligence on the study, will abundantly confirm."

He gives another quotation which leads us to conclude that it required a considerable amount of labour for a person to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the pronunciation of the Chaldaic. "Hieronymus complains of the difficulty he had had in acquiring the Chaldaic. He says, 'I, who thought myself a proficient among the Hebrews, began again to be a learner among the Chaldees, and, to confess the truth, up to the present day I am better able to read and understand the Chaldee language than to pronounce it.'"

We may perhaps venture to hazard the conjecture, that the dialect spoken in Babylon in the days of Daniel bore a relation to that of the aboriginal Chaldeans, similar to that which the language of modern Italy bears to the tongue of ancient Rome. The vocables had been originally the same, but the pronunciation was different. It was that of a race of conquerors, "a nation from afar, a mighty nation, an ancient nation,

whose language thou knowest not, neither understandest what they say;" who, having made themselves masters of Babylon, adopted the speech of the Chaldeans, but retained their own pronunciation.

Whatever the difference may have been between the Hebrew and the Chaldaic, we have every reason for concluding that the Jews, after their return to their native land, continued to speak the Hebrew tongue in its purity.

Some modern philologists confidently affirm the contrary, and tell us that they used so many words of foreign origin that their dialect was altogether new. To this corrupted Hebrew our literati have given the name of the Aramaic; but of its existence they adduce no evidence.

During their captivity the children of Israel had neither forsaken the God, nor forgotten the language of their fathers. The language of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, is the language of Samuel and Moses. A few changes must no doubt have taken place upon it; but from the Exodus out of Egypt, B.C. 1491, down to the re-establishment of the Commonwealth by Nehemiah, in B.C. 434, a period of more than a thousand years, the language of the Jews remained, in all its essential features, unchanged.

CHAPTER III.

OUTLINE HISTORY OF THE JEWS AFTER THEIR RETURN FROM BABYLON.

In order the more accurately to judge of the arguments employed by different authors in support of the theories which they adduce in regard to the language of the Jews, we shall now give a brief outline of the history of the children of Israel after their return to their native land, directing attention more especially to the varying circumstances in which they were placed, as these may be supposed to have influenced the national speech.

I. B.C. 536. *Return from Babylon.*—According to the ordinary computation, it was in the year B.C. 536 that Cyrus issued his proclamation that the house of the Lord God of Israel should be rebuilt.

In obedience to this decree a great many of the children of the captivity assembled together, and formed a company to return to the land of their fathers. Encouraged by the gifts of the king, who at the same time restored to them all the vessels of the sanctuary, and aided by the liberal contributions of their fellow-citizens,

they set out on their march, and settled again in the promised land.

In "the seventh month," we are told, "the people gathered themselves together as one man to Jerusalem," and builded the altar of the God of Israel. They at the same time made preparation for rebuilding the temple, but it was not till the second month of the second year after their coming to Jerusalem that the foundation was formally laid.

Though Zerubbabel seems to have been acknowledged as the legitimate heir to the throne of David, and though he was honoured as the prince of the tribe of Judah, the monarchy was not restored. This circumstance leads us to conclude, that having been taught by the sore experience of former ages that it was not good for Israel to have "a king over them like other nations," their great endeavour, after the return from Babylon, was to re-establish a theocracy, like that which had existed in the days of the Judges, when the elders of the people, the high priests, and prophets, directed the affairs of the nation.

During a period of seventy-nine years, those who had returned from Babylon were occupied in restoring the commonwealth, rebuilding the temple, and ordering the service of God. The solemnity and earnestness with which they proceeded, and the difficulties with which they had to contend, are fully related in the Book of Ezra. We are told, on the one hand, of the malice and

misrepresentations of their enemies, and of the interruption that was thereby caused to their work; and, on the other hand, we are informed of the encouragement they received from several of the Persian monarchs.

At length, we learn in Ezra vi. 14, "the elders of the Jews builded, and they prospered through the prophesying of Haggai the prophet and Zechariah the son of Iddo. And they builded, and finished it, according to the commandment of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes kings of Persia. And the house was finished on the third day of the month Adar, which was in the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king."

It was during the period to which we now refer that the events took place which are described in the Book of Esther.

II. B.C. 457. *Arrival of Ezra.*—The next period in the history of the Jews is that which elapsed after the arrival of Ezra, and before the coming of Nehemiah.

The temple had been rebuilt, and its services restored, when Ezra, "a ready scribe in the law of Moses," was sent from Babylon, the king giving this commandment, "And thou, Ezra, after the wisdom of thy God, that is in thine hand, set magistrates and judges, which may judge all the people that are beyond the river, all such as know the laws of thy God; and teach ye them that know them not."

Ezra, thus empowered by the commandment of the king, set himself to reform the abuses that had been

introduced during the long period in which the government had been weak and ineffective.

In the ninth chapter we are told of the grief and astonishment that he felt when informed that "the holy seed had mingled themselves with the people of those lands," and had married strange wives. We are farther told, that after deep humiliation and earnest prayer he called a convocation of the people together. In response to this invitation, "there assembled unto him out of Israel a very great congregation," and after consultation they entered into covenant with God "to put away all the strange wives and such as were born of them."

The carrying out of this national resolution was the first part of Ezra's work. He seems thereafter to have set himself with earnest endeavour to fulfil that part of the king's commandment which required him to teach the people the laws of his God.

We have no account in the sacred record of the manner in which the task was carried on, but the concurrent testimony of the Jewish historians leaves us no room to doubt that it was during this period that the work of collecting, revising, and copying the Old Testament Scriptures was most earnestly prosecuted.

III. B.C. 446. *Arrival of Nehemiah.*—The determination of the Jews, under Ezra, to put away their strange wives, and to separate from all those who refused to comply with the national resolution, naturally

tended to increase the hatred with which their heathen neighbours regarded them, and the removal of those who refused to comply with the injunction, and who afterwards established the rival temple and sect of the Samaritans, must have had very considerable influence on the political strength of the Hebrew commonwealth. We are consequently told that "the remnant who were left of the captivity in the province were in great affliction and reproach." Nehemiah, therefore, after earnest prayer, applied to the King of Persia, and got authority from him to build the wall of Jerusalem, and restore the ancient polity of Israel.

The Book which he has written is occupied with an account of the devoted and energetic manner in which he executed his commission. He rebuilt the wall of Jerusalem, and set up its gates—he enforced the law of Moses in regard to the keeping of the Sabbath and the observance of the appointed feasts—he carried out yet more stringently the enactment of Ezra, which required a separation from the surrounding nations. We are told of the indignation he felt when he saw Jews that had married wives of Ashdod and Moab, and whose children could not speak in the Jews' language, but spake according to the language of each people, and we read that without respect of persons he chased the transgressors from him, and "cleansed Israel from all strangers."

IV. B.C. 434. *The Jewish Polity completed.*—After

twelve years labour Nehemiah completed his reforms. He seems to have succeeded in establishing the theocratical form of government in a more systematic and efficient condition than it had ever been in before—the high priests and rulers of the people, or Sanhedrim, as they were afterwards termed, exercising the supreme authority, with the assistance of such men as God from time to time raised up among their brethren.

We have no farther record of the Jewish history by any inspired authority. In fact, any record we have of the following hundred and fifty years is very brief and uncertain.

It was during this period that the knowledge of the Scriptures was most widely diffused, and a reverence for them was most thoroughly awakened. It was during this time that, through the study of God's Word, especially of such passages as the intimation given in the twelfth chapter of Daniel in reference to a future state, and guided still farther, we may conjecture, by the oral instructions of Ezra, they came to form those clear views of the resurrection which were so firmly held in the days of our Saviour, both by their teachers and by the great body of the people. It was at this time, in short, that a people who, in preceding ages, had ever been prone to adopt the manners and customs of those who lived around them, and who had only been kept from gross idolatry by the often-repeated chastenings inflicted on them by God, became zealous for the

law and the prophets, and imbued with an intense aversion to idolatry in every form.

For upwards of a century the Jews continued tributary to the Persians, whose yoke, however, does not seem to have been heavy. In the year B.C. 332, Alexander invaded Asia, and the empire passed to the Greeks. At first Judea seems to have been left very much to itself, though, no doubt, it would be affected by the contests of contending empires, the introduction into its neighbourhood of a foreign race, and the increasing influence of the European invaders.

V. B.C. 304. *Judea subjected to the rule of Egypt.*—In this year the Jews became subject to the Ptolemaic Empire of Egypt. They no doubt suffered from the exactions of their conquerors, and found a more intimate intercourse with their heathen neighbours exercise an injurious influence on their religious condition; but they do not seem to have been severely oppressed. They became a large and influential part of the Alexandrian population, and the interest which seems to have been taken by the Egyptian monarch in getting a Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures may be taken as an evidence that no intense antipathy was entertained towards their religion.

VI. B.C. 217. *Judea brought under the government of Syria.*—After the defeat of the Egyptians at the battle of Raphia, Judea came under the dominion of Syria. The increasing influence of Grecian customs produced

the most disastrous effects. A party manifesting very decidedly a preference for heathenish practices, purchased from Antiochus the office of high priest, and sought to transform the house of God at Jerusalem into a temple for the worship of Jupiter. In this endeavour he was supported by the power of the Syrian Empire, and many of the Jews concurred in departing from the worship of God. This defection from the faith of their fathers, on the part of an influential section of the Jewish people, and the depression and persecution of those who retained their steadfastness, continued for about forty years. It was succeeded by the heroic efforts of the Maccabees and their associates, who continued successfully to resist the power of their heathen oppressors for other forty years, when the arrival of the Romans put an end to the Grecian rule.

VII. B.C. 135. *Supremacy of the Romans.*—After the establishment of the Roman sovereignty, though the Jews were compelled to pay custom and tribute, the form of government as completed by Nehemiah was allowed to remain, with comparatively little change, till the advent of our Lord.

CHAPTER IV.

THE EFFECT OF THE MEASURES INTRODUCED BY EZRA AND NEHEMIAH.

In considering the language of Israel, previous to the time of Nehemiah, we showed the evidence we have that it had remained essentially unchanged from the days of Moses.

We farther remarked, that this peculiar attachment to their national speech was perfectly consistent with the general principles that regulate all the varied dialects that are spoken by the families of men. The Jews were all descended from one parent; they had laws and religious services which were intended by God to keep them separate from the nations around them; they were taught to look on any intimate alliance with strangers as a sin; and to regard themselves as a holy and a peculiar people. The natural effect of their being kept thus separate from other people necessarily tended to preserve in its purity their original tongue.

All these influences must have operated with still greater power after the return from Babylon.

We observe, in the first place, that while the decree

of Cyrus directed the people to return to Jerusalem and to rebuild the temple of God, there was no compulsion used. Gifts were largely bestowed, and every encouragement was offered, but those who preferred to remain in the land of their exile were in no ways molested. When, therefore, we remember the distance between Babylon and Judea, the dreary and dangerous road the travellers had to traverse, and the desolate prospect which a city in ruins presented to their imagination, we can easily suppose that only the more zealous and patriotic would venture on the journey. We may be sure there would be no mixed multitude among them, like that which went up at the Exodus from Egypt, hankering after the idolatrous indulgences of the heathen.

Among a company so select, we naturally conclude that there must have existed a more than ordinary attachment to the religious customs and language of their fathers.

The abolition of monarchy, and the re-establishment of a theocracy like that which prevailed in the days of Samuel, tended yet farther to separate the inhabitants of Jerusalem from the people around them. Unlike the nations of the West, among whom republican forms of government find favour, the natives of the East have always shown a desire for the pomp and pageantry of a king. A government by priests and elders, without external grandeur or military parade, would have little

attraction for any, excepting those who feared the Lord God of Israel, and venerated the revelation which He had given.

The measures introduced by Ezra and Nehemiah must have operated with peculiar efficacy on a people thus selected and thus circumstanced. We have already remarked on the zeal of those two devoted servants of God, in restoring the laws of Moses and the temple service. We have seen how cordially the people seconded their efforts, and with what determination they banished all who had united themselves to the heathen, and refused to part with the daughters of the aliens whom they had married. Those who had no sincere regard to the traditions of their fathers, found nothing to induce them to continue under such a government as that which Nehemiah established, and accordingly we may believe that many of them removed from under his rule. On the other hand, those that remained, having the temple and its service restored, their freedom secured, the walls of the city repaired, and their country enriched with all the blessings that flow from peace and equitable government, regarded the established theocracy with gratitude and with pride. The alienation and contempt with which the Jews came to regard the Gentiles, show the extent to which these feelings were carried.

All these circumstances tended to keep their language unchanged; but above all other influences in preserving

its purity, the building of Synagogues throughout the land, and the regular reading in them of the Word of God, was undoubtedly the chief.

The manner in which they read and explained the sacred oracles is fully detailed in the eighth chapter of Nehemiah. We read of the solemn assembly of all the men and women, of Ezra standing upon a pulpit of wood above all the people, opening the book, when "all the people stood up, and Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God; and all the people answered, Amen." It is added in a subsequent verse, "So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading."

Here we have a service described which very closely resembled that which is observed in many churches at the present day; in which the clergyman, after reading the Word of God, gives an exposition, that his hearers may understand its meaning. It is to such a practice as this that the people of Scotland are more especially indebted for their knowledge of the Scriptures.

We are aware that some have spoken of the passage which we have quoted as if it implied that the people had forgotten the language of their fathers, and therefore needed an interpretation.

Such an argument needs no refutation. If we were told that when a large congregation had assembled for religious service, a clergyman, after reading a portion of Scripture, "gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading," would any one venture to say that from this account we must infer that the people were ignorant of the language in which the book was written, and that the lesson of the day must have been read in Greek or in Hebrew?

The ordinance by which the Scriptures were read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day continued, as we learn from the Book of Acts, to be faithfully observed down to the times of the Apostles.

Dr Lightfoot, whose learning and research entitle him to be regarded as an authority in matters of fact, though we may question the soundness of some of the conclusions which he has drawn, gives a very distinct testimony in regard to the language employed in the public worship of the Jews after the time of their dispersion. In his addenda to the fourteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, he says, "Many passages may be produced, whereby it appears that the Hebrew text was read in the synagogues of the Hebrews, that is in those of Palestine and Babylon, and whosesoever mother tongue was Syriac or Chaldaic."

It is a yet more remarkable fact, that such is the strange, we might almost say idolatrous, reverence which the Jews have for the ordinance appointed by Ezra, that even in the present day, both in Germany and in England, it is their custom to read the Scriptures in the original tongue in the public service of their synagogues.

If we look on the public reading of God's Word merely as a means of communicating instruction in the doctrines which it contains, we cannot commend the practice of reading the Scriptures in the original tongue, when the Hebrew has become almost entirely obsolete. But if we regard it in another light, and look on it as a means of perpetuating a reverential regard for the language and laws of their fathers, we then acknowledge that no system could have been devised better fitted for accomplishing the end in view.

The temple is in ruins, and sacrifices have ceased. Israel, downtrodden and despised, is scattered over all the regions of the earth; but the measures introduced by Ezra and Nehemiah continue to be observed even to the present day, and exercise a mighty power in keeping the house of Jacob distinct from the nations around. This conservative influence, we doubt not, will continue until the day shall arrive when, restored to their country and to the favour of their God, the promises made to their fathers shall be fulfilled, and the world shall rejoice in "the receiving of them again as life from the dead."

CHAPTER V.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE JEWS IN THE DAYS OF OUR LORD.

UNTIL a comparatively recent period the common, we believe we might say the universal, opinion of theologians was, that the Jews in the days of our Lord continued to speak the language of their fathers.

But a new school of Biblical critics has arisen, by a large number of whom we are told that, after the return from Babylon, the Jews employed a dialect so corrupted by the introduction of foreign words and idioms, that it formed, in fact, an altogether different language, to which they have given the name of the Aramaic.

Others of them go yet farther, and affirm that the prevailing tongue in Judea in the days of our Lord was Greek.

These conclusions, however, have nothing brought forward in their support but vague and unfounded conjectures; we therefore pass them by, and, judging from a careful perusal of the Gospel narrative, we unhesitatingly affirm, that in the days of our Lord the ordinary language of the Jews was Hebrew.

In the first chapter of John we have an account of the conversation which Jesus held with Andrew and

Peter. The words of the evangelist certainly suggest the idea that the language they employed was Hebrew. "Then Jesus turned, and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye? They said unto him, Rabbi, (which is to say, being interpreted, Master,) where dwellest thou? He saith unto them, Come and see. They came and saw where he dwelt, and abode with him that day: for it was about the tenth hour. One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ. And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, A stone."

In Mark we are told, "And Simon he surnamed Peter; and James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he surnamed them Boanerges, which is, The sons of thunder."

Again we read, that when Jesus made himself known to Mary Magdalene after his resurrection, "Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni, which is to say, Master." This narrative certainly leads us to conclude, that the language in which Mary had been accustomed to address the Saviour was the Hebrew.

In the seventh chapter of Mark we are told, that in passing through the coasts of Decapolis, where we might

suppose the language of the foreigner more especially to have prevailed, in consequence of the number of Gentile settlers there, they brought unto Him one that was deaf, and He "put his fingers into his ears, and he spit, and touched his tongue; and looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened. And straightway his ears were opened." This account seems very clearly to prove that the language spoken in the coasts of Decapolis was not Greek but Hebrew.

In the account given of the raising of Jairns' daughter, Luke relates the particulars with great brevity: "He put them all out, and took her by the hand, and called, saying, Maid, arise. And her spirit came again, and she arose straightway." Mark is more circumstantial, and gives not only the import of the words addressed to her, but the words themselves, as if he had been repeating the description of an eye-witness, on whose mind the scene had made a deep and abiding impression: "But when he had put them all out, he taketh the father and the mother of the damsel, and them that were with him, and entereth in where the damsel was lying. And he took the damsel by the hand, and said unto her, Talitha cumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise. And straightway the damsel arose, and walked; for she was of the age of twelve years. And they were astonished with a great astonishment."

The cry of agony on the cross, *Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?* while it shows that our Saviour was acquainted with Hebrew, cannot be quoted as evidence that it was in that language He usually held conversation with others.

It has been said that if the ordinary conversation between our Saviour and His apostles had been carried on in Hebrew, we might have expected the fact to have been distinctly stated. To this we reply, that there was no need for giving any such explanation. Those to whom the Gospel narrative was at first communicated were all aware that the language of the Jews was Hebrew. We may farther remark, that until a very recent period no other opinion seems ever to have been entertained.

If we observe the style and manner of the sacred writers, we find that it was only when there was some particular significance attached to the language employed that we are told what it was. In the account of Paul's conversion, which is given in the ninth chapter of Acts, we are told of the voice that he heard from heaven; but we are not told whether it spake in Greek or Hebrew. When he afterwards described the miraculous occurrence to King Agrippa, he told him that it spake "in the Hebrew tongue." This circumstance, which was not noticed in the previous account of his conversion, is here mentioned, in order, we may suppose, that the monarch, who "believed the prophets,"

might the more readily be persuaded that it was the God of Israel who on that occasion addressed the Apostle.

In like manner, though Joseph spoke to his brethren through an interpreter, no notice is taken of this having been the case till it was necessary to record the fact, in order that the circumstances of the narrative might be understood more clearly.

It is only, as we have just remarked, on a very few occasions that the name of the language employed is mentioned. When it is said to have been the Hebrew, the context leads us to conclude that it was the same as that which bore the venerated name in times of old.

For example, we are told that the inscription on the cross was written in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. That inscription was intended to be read of all, but there is no mention made of the Aramaic, which our critics tell us had become the ordinary medium of conversation. When Paul addressed the multitude, Acts xxii., we are told that he spake in the "Hebrew tongue." There is no intimation that the language he employed differed from that spoken by their fathers. When, therefore, the inspired historian says he spake in Hebrew, we should have something more than a mere conjecture before we say that he did not speak in Hebrew, but in a mongrel dialect that had usurped the place and the name of the original tongue.

The truth is, we have no evidence whatever in support of these conjectures in regard to the Aramaic

tongue. There are no remains of any literary work written in it. There is no reference made to it by any ancient author. And though the Jews, with a praiseworthy desire of diffusing the knowledge of the sacred Scriptures, made versions into the Greek, the Syriac, the Arabic, and several other tongues, there is no version into the Aramaic, which our learned men suppose to have been the vernacular dialect of Judea.

While in the days of our Saviour Hebrew was the general language of the Jews, the different provinces of the Holy Land seem all to have had their peculiar characteristic pronunciation, in the same manner as the different districts of Israel had in the times of the *shibboleth*. The Galilean is referred to as particularly remarkable. We are told of the bystanders saying to Peter, "Thou art a Galilean, and thy speech agreeth thereto;" and in the description of the miraculous gift of tongues, we are informed that the people exclaimed, "Are not all these that speak Galileans?"

In all probability, there were also peculiar words and provincial expressions, but these differences did not prevent the inhabitant of Jerusalem from being understood by the Galilean, or the Galilean from being intelligible to the dweller in Judea.

These various dialects do not seem to have differed in any important particular from the language of Moses and the prophets. In their pronunciation they may have stood in a relation to each other, somewhat similar

to that in which the provincial dialects of our own country stand to those of the surrounding districts, but the words were substantially the same.

As in Britain at the present time, so in Judea and Galilee in the days of the Lord, the sacred Scriptures were publicly read in the religious assemblies all over the country, and were not only reverenced as the medium by which the revelation of heaven had been communicated to men, but being understood by all, they kept the language from change, and were recognised as the standard of correct composition.

This conclusion is confirmed when we direct our attention to the account of Paul's address to the people in the 22nd chapter of Acts. In that passage we are told, that "when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more silence." The peculiar attention which they paid to his words because they were Hebrew, is a manifest evidence that they not only understood, but that they reverenced the language in which he addressed them.

If they did not know the meaning of what he said, why was their indignation roused when he stated some unpalatable truths which offended their national pride? It was because they understood the meaning of his words and felt the force of his argument that they cried out, "Away with such a fellow from the earth: for it is not fit that he should live."

The request made by the Apostle to the chief cap-

tain, and the remarks which his address called forth, prove most distinctly that Greek was not commonly spoken by the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

In the 37th verse we are told, that "as Paul was to be led into the castle, he said unto the chief captain, May I speak unto thee? Who said, Canst thou speak Greek? Art not thou that Egyptian, which before these days madest an uproar, and leddest out into the wilderness four thousand men that were murderers?" If Greek had been commonly spoken either by the Jews or by the Egyptians, Paul's address would have occasioned no surprise. The questions put by the chief captain show very conclusively, that neither in Judea, nor even in Egypt, where the power of the Grecian monarchs had prevailed much longer, and had been more fully confirmed than in Judea, had the language of Greece become the vernacular dialect of the country.

CHAPTER VI.

THE QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT MADE BY OUR LORD AND HIS APOSTLES WERE TAKEN FROM THE HEBREW.

VARIOUS opinions have been expressed in regard to the discrepancies that exist between the Septuagint and the quotations found in the New Testament. Dr Roberts says—"The quotations from the Old Testament, introduced by the Apostle into his discourse, agree for the most part with the phraseology of the Septuagint, presenting only those slight variations, omissions, and additions, which naturally occur in the case of one quoting from memory, and which are generally found in the citations made by the writers in the New Testament." Mr Grosart, in a notice which appeared in the "British and Foreign Evangelical Review," says—"In no single instance does the New Testament give the exact words of the Septuagint; sometimes abridging, sometimes enlarging, and sometimes deepening and transfiguring them into larger meanings."

Between the Septuagint and the New Testament citations the difference in meaning is very slight. The

discrepancy consists almost entirely in the manner of expression. We cannot help thinking, therefore, that Mr Grosart's language is too strong, and suggests the idea that there is a greater diversity between them than really exists. On the other hand, we cannot concur in the opinion of Dr Roberts, that the variations are such as "naturally occur in the case of one quoting from memory." In determining a question of minute verbal criticism, we do not wish to speak with undue confidence; but we think that we get a much more probable solution of the difficulty, by supposing that the New Testament quotations are translations made by the inspired penmen from the Hebrew Scriptures which they had themselves been accustomed to hear; while the Septuagint is an altogether different version, made at a former time from the same original.

We frankly say, moreover, that we do not like to ascribe to our Lord and His Apostles, *when speaking by inspiration of the Holy Spirit*, such a deficiency of memory as Dr Roberts' supposition implies.

In order that our readers may be able to form an opinion for themselves, we take the Gospel by Matthew as a specimen of the whole, and out of the thirty-four quotations which it contains, we select seven in which the difference is most perceptible.

We give, in the first place, the quotations found in the New Testament. These we believe to be translations of the Hebrew text, as it was read in the synagogues in the days of our Lord, and we look on those who made them as having been guided by the inspiration of God.

We give, in the next place, a translation of the passages cited, as they are found in the Septuagint, which we consider to be another version of the same original, made by men who were learned and faithful, but who were not aided, in making their translation, by supernatural power.

We give, in the last place, the passages as they are found in the English Old Testament, which we look on as a translation of a slightly abridged, and in some measure inaccurate, copy of the ancient Hebrew.

QUOTATIONS FOUND IN THE GOSPEL BY MATTHEW.

New Testament.—Chap. ii. 6—"And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel."

Septuagint.—"And thou Bethlehem, House of Ephrata, art thou the least among the thousands of Judah? Out of thee shall come one to be for me, the ruler of Israel."—Micah v. 2.

Old Testament.—"But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel."

Chap. ii. 18—"In Rama was there a voice heard,

lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not."

SEPT.—"In Rama a voice was heard of lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children and would not cease, because they are not."—Jeremiah xxxi. 15.

O. T.—"A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation, and bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not."

Chap. iii. 3—"The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight."

SEPT.—"The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make the paths of our God straight."—Isaiah xl. 3.

O. T.—"The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God."

Chap. iv. 15, 16—"The land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles; the people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up."

SEPT.—"The land of Zabulon and the land of Nephthalim, and the others by way of the sea and beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles. Oh people, walking in

darkness, ye saw a great light, and ye who walked in the region and shadow of death light has shone upon you."—Isaiah ix. 1.

O. T.—"The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations. The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined."

Chap. xii. 18-21—"Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall show judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory. And in his name shall the Gentiles trust."

SEPT.—"Jacob is my servant, I will help him; Israel is my chosen, my soul has accepted him. I have put my spirit upon him, he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry nor lift up, neither shall his voice be heard without. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench; but he shall bring forth judgment to truth. He shall shine out, and shall not be broken (discouraged), until he have set judgment on the earth, and in his name shall the Gentiles trust."—Isaiah xlii.

O. T.—"Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law."

Chap. xiii. 14, 15—"By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them."

Sept.—"Ye shall hear indeed, but ye shall not understand; and ye shall see indeed, but ye shall not perceive. For the heart of this people has become gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed, lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them."—Isaiah vi. 9.

O. T.—"Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed."

Chap. xv. 8, 9—"This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Sept.—"This people draw nigh to me with their mouth, and honour me with their lips; but their heart is far from me, but in vain do they worship me, teaching the commandments and doctrines of men."—Isaiah xxix. 13.

O. T.—"This people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precepts of men."

These extracts are sufficient to show that the differences found between the various versions of the Old Testament Scriptures affect very slightly the meaning of the passages in which they occur, and that we must be very cautious lest our language should suggest the idea that there is a greater diversity between them than really exists.

At the same time, they certainly lead to the conclusion that the verbal discrepancies which we find between the Septuagint and the Old Testament quotations are not to be accounted for by assuming an imperfect re-

collection on the part of the Apostles and the Evangelists, but rather by supposing that these quotations were made by the inspired penmen from the Hebrew Scriptures, which they had themselves been accustomed to hear; while the Septuagint is an altogether different version of the same original, made at a former time.

CHAPTER VII.

THE PREVALENCE OF GREEK IN THE WESTERN PART OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.—OPINION OF M. MAX MULLER.

Professor Roberts has lately published some very elaborate "Discussions on the Gospels," in which he endeavours to prove that while "the Jews in our Saviour's time commonly used both Greek and Aramaic, the one language being employed in public intercourse of all kinds, and the other in more domestic and familiar transactions," . . . . "the prevalence of such a dialect in Palestine, as the Greek of the New Testament, in the days of Christ and His Apostles, can only be accounted for on the ground that it was then the prevailing public language of the country," . . . . and "that our Lord and His disciples did, for the most part, make use of the Greek language."

In order to support these views, he endeavours to prove that in the days of our Saviour the language of Greece prevailed throughout the Roman Empire. He says, "Greek, and not Latin, was really, during the period in question, the language of the Roman Empire." —P. 33.

We shall consider his arguments as they refer, first, to the West; and, in the next place, to the East.

After adducing a number of extracts, to show how widely the knowledge of Greek was diffused throughout the realms of the West, as well as of the East, and referring to Vossius, Credner, and other German authors, as concurring in his conclusions, he gives a quotation from one, whom he appropriately terms "an eminent living authority among ourselves, Max Muller," who says, "The fact is, that so long as we know anything of Italy, the Greek language was as much at home there as the Latin."

If the question were to be decided by the verdict of authorities, Dr Roberts' hypothesis admits of little dispute. But we are not prepared to bow down at once, either to his confident decision, "that the Greek, and not Latin, was, during the period in question, the language of the Roman Empire," or to the more moderate opinion of Professor Max Muller, that "the Greek was as much at home in Italy as the Latin."

At the time of our Saviour's sojourn upon earth, the Greek had acquired an influence and a diffusion over the civilised world such as no other language has ever attained either in ancient or in modern times. It was the tongue in which men of science and literature conducted their correspondence, and thus occupied the place which Latin held in the days of our fathers. It was the language of the Court and of fashionable life,

and occupied a position like that held by the French previous to the Revolution in 1792; and above all, it was the language of travel and of commerce. It was, in short, the general channel of communication among almost all the nations of the civilised world.

Thus far we are happy to concur with the opinion of Dr Roberts. And as we trace the appointment of a wise and gracious God in bringing so large a proportion of the human race under one supreme government, when the period came for the promulgation of the new dispensation, so we see His providential arrangement in preparing a language so generally understood to be the medium by which its doctrines might be made known.

But though it was at once the language of learning and of fashion, of travel and of commerce, it does not follow that it was the speech of every-day life throughout the various countries that owned the sway of Rome.

The best means of ascertaining the vernacular tongue of the Romans during the decline and fall of the Empire, is a careful endeavour to trace back to their original source the languages spoken by their descendants at the present time.

After the conquest of Gaul and Spain, a great many of the Italians, who had been enriched with the plunder of the world, went and settled in these countries. They carried with them their arts and arms, their laws, and the Latin tongue. They emigrated in such numbers that the aboriginal inhabitants had either to retire before

them, or conform to the customs and manners of their invaders. Gaul and Spain having been thus colonised by settlers from Italy, the whole population might be regarded as of Italian origin, and the nations into which it has been formed have been generally, and most appropriately, termed the Latin races.

When the Romans were, in their turn, overcome by the barbarians from the North, the conquerors formed the smaller part of the population, and amalgamating with them, according to the general principles which regulate language when such mixtures of races take place, the conquering minority adopted the vocables of the vanquished majority, while every race of the invaders retained more or less of its own distinctive pronunciation.

On examining the different dialects spoken by the nations that rose from the fall of the Empire, we find that the differences by which they are distinguished are in general such as may be attributed to peculiarities of pronunciation, while by far the greater part of the words of the modern Italian, the Provencal or Southern French, the French, the Spanish, and the Portuguese, are derived from Latin roots. The words taken directly from the Greek seem to be but few.

We therefore conclude, that the language of the Western parts of the Roman Empire was not Greek but Latin, during the whole period of its existence.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PREVALENCE OF GREEK IN PALESTINE.—ARGUMENTS OF DR ROBERTS.

We have already stated the conclusions to which Dr Roberts has come in regard to the prevalence of Greek among the Jews.

The consideration of these conclusions we delayed till we had examined his wider and more general assertion, that "Greek, and not Latin, was really, during the period in question, the language of the Roman Empire."

We now direct attention to the arguments he employs, in order to prove that Greek was the prevailing language in Palestine. We shall endeavour to state them as clearly and fairly as we can.

The quotations from the Old Testament, made by our Saviour and His Apostles. The quotations from the Old Testament, made by our Lord and His Apostles, differ so much from the Hebrew text, and bear such a close resemblance to the Septuagint, that we are led to conclude they must have been taken from the Greek; and having been used in discussions and public ad-

dresses, we are led to believe that the Septuagint must have been in common use at that time among the Jews.

Such is the substance of Dr Roberts' argument; and if the premises be granted, the deduction naturally follows. But the investigations into which we have entered have led to a very different result. We have seen reason to believe that we have not now a full and accurate copy of the volume collected and collated by Ezra; that the Septuagint is a faithful and careful translation of the Canon of Ezra; and that the present Hebrew text is an abridged, and, consequently, in some measure, an inaccurate copy. We therefore conclude, that the quotations made in the New Testament agree with the Septuagint, not because they were taken from the Greek, but because the Scriptures in use among the Jews in the days of the Apostles, and from which they quoted, agreed with those which the translators of the Septuagint had employed. We observe farther, that the differences that are found between these quotations and the Septuagint are not, as Dr Roberts supposes, the variations which naturally arise in the case of one quoting from memory, but are the diversities of expression that necessarily occur when two translators give, each of them, an independent version of the same original.

We do not consider it necessary again to go over the arguments which we have already examined.

The influence of the Syrian rule. We next direct attention to what Dr Roberts says of the influence exerted on the language of the Jews by their subjugation to the Syrians, which he seems to think was mainly instrumental in introducing the use of Greek.

After telling us, p. 38, of the endeavours made by King Antiochus "to root out the superstitions of the country, and establish the institutions of the Greeks," he proceeds to say, "we naturally infer from such a persistent course of policy, on the part of the rulers of Palestine, that, as in the somewhat analogous case of the Norman supremacy in England, the language so favoured by the Court would gradually encroach upon the ancient vernacular dialect, and would inevitably in process of time become prevalent, not only as the language of refinement, but as that of general public intercourse and instruction."

The reference to the influence of the Norman conquest is rather unfortunate for Dr Roberts' argument. We have formerly shown that its effects on the English language was remarkably small.

Let us now consider what are the facts of history in regard to the Syrian occupation of Judea. In the year B.C. 217, Antiochus got possession of the country. Aided by some renegade Israelites, he sought to introduce the religion and language of Greece. After 40 years of oppression, the Syrian rulers so effectually roused the indignation of the people that the Jews broke out into open rebellion. Under the direction of the Maccabees and their associates, they carried on the war with heroic

endurance, and sometimes with signal success. This embittered contest continued for other 40 years, when the Romans invaded Asia, proclaimed the Jews their friends and allies, and speedily put an end to the Syrian power. Such is the history of the dominion which Antiochus and his successors exercised over Judea.

What inducement had the Jews to cast aside the speech of their fathers, in order to adopt that of oppressors whom they hated, and had so heroically resisted?

The 80 years of Syrian supremacy, instead of "making the language favoured by the Court encroach upon the ancient vernacular dialect," could only have intensified the reverence entertained for the Hebrew, which had been preserved unchanged by their fathers for 1300 years.

The Edicts of the Roman Governors in Syro-Phœnicia were published in Greek and Latin. We shall, in the next place, consider the somewhat laboured argument by which Dr Roberts endeavours to prove that the Syro-Phœnicians made use of the language of Greece. "Let us mark," he says, "the language which St Luke (chapter vi. 17) employs with respect to the persons to whom the sermon which he reports was addressed. They are described by the evangelist as follows:—'And he came down with them, and stood in the plain, and the company of his disciples, and a great multitude of people out of all Judæa and Jerusalem, and from the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, which came to hear him,

and to be healed of their diseases.' We thus learn that among our Lord's audience on this occasion there were the inhabitants at once of Jerusalem, and of Tyre, and of Sidon. In the discourse which follows it is manifest that the whole multitude was simultaneously addressed, and that, of course, in a language which all understood. What, then, was that language? Will any one maintain that it was Hebrew, in the face of that clear evidence which we possess, that Greek was the only language then generally employed in the region of Tyre and Sidon? Josephus has preserved an edict of Mark Antony, addressed to the people of Tyre, which says, 'M. Antony, imperator, to the magistrates, senate, and people of Tyre, sendeth greeting. I have sent you my decree, respecting which I will that ye take care that it be engraven on the public tables in Roman and Greek letters, and that it stand engraven in the most conspicuous places, so as to be read of all.' It is plain from this that Greek was the language of the district, and that no other was commonly employed, since, in addition to the official Latin, Greek was the only tongue in which the edict was commanded to be published. In like manner we read respecting Sidon, that Julius Cæsar sent a decree to its inhabitants, which contained the injunction that it should be 'publicly set forth on a tablet of brass in the Greek and Latin languages.' Again, we are told of the cities, Tyre, Sidon, and Ascalon, that a decree of the same Roman magistrate

was ordered to be published at each of them, in the Greek and Latin languages. It seems too plain from all this to admit of any denial, that Greek was then the only language commonly employed by the natives of the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, so that a discourse intended to be understood by them must of necessity have been delivered in the Greek language. But if this conclusion be admitted, the whole controversy may be regarded as settled. Conceding that the discourse recorded by St Luke was spoken by our Lord in Greek, it will be difficult any longer to deny that Greek was the language which he commonly employed. There were on the occasion referred to, the inhabitants of Judæa and Jerusalem, no less than of Decapolis, and Tyre, and Sidon, among His hearers; and it is quite evident from the evangelistic narrative that all equally understood Him, and were, therefore, all perfectly familiar with the Greek language."

We do not acknowledge the force of Dr Roberts' arguments. At the time when these proclamations were issued, the supremacy over Syro-Phœnicia had just passed away from the Grecian to the Roman. Greek had previously been, and Latin then was, as Dr Roberts terms it, the official language. Both of them, therefore, might very fitly have been employed in public intimations. But we have no evidence whatever that either the one or the other of them was the ordinary language of the people.

Confining our attention to the Syro-Phœnicians, we are ready to allow that the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon, and the other cities on the sea coast, depending, as they did, for their prosperity on trade, were very generally acquainted with Greek, which was peculiarly the language of commerce. But we have nothing to prove that it was the *only* language that was spoken in the district. If, as Dr Roberts supposes, "the Jews in our Saviour's time commonly used both Greek and Aramaic, the one language being employed in public intercourse of all kinds, and the other in more domestic and familiar transactions," why may we not suppose that the inhabitants of the sea coast, while they understood Greek, continued to use in their familiar intercourse the language of their fathers, which, if not the same as that of the Jews, was a dialect of the Syriac, that closely resembled it.

We may also remark, that Dr Roberts forgets to observe that the people had a double object in coming to Jesus. St Luke tells us that they "came to hear him, and to be healed of their diseases." A hope of being healed would, no doubt, have a powerful effect in quickening their attention to our Saviour's discourse, even though the language was not altogether familiar.

We farther object to the quotations that are brought forward, inasmuch as the whole facts of the case are not stated. There is no notice taken of the circumstances that led to the promulgation of the edicts to which they

refer. When we consult the Jewish historian, we find that his countrymen, after having for a long time struggled against the Grecian rulers of Syria, had latterly suffered also from the exactions of the Roman armies who were opposed to Antony and Cæsar. But when the Jews had entered into alliance with these two generals, public intimation was given that they had become confederate with Rome. And Josephus informs us that the edicts which he quotes were especially intended to restrain the violence of their former oppressors.

Whatever the language of the native inhabitants may have been, decrees directed against Grecian and Roman marauders were most appropriately promulgated in Greek and Latin.

The inscriptions on coins and monuments. Dr Roberts refers to the inscriptions on coins and monuments as a proof of the prevalence of Greek. "The inscriptions existing on ruins in Palestine are decidedly favourable to our proposition. They are far more numerous in Greek than in the native dialects of the country. All of them probably belong to a somewhat later age than that of Christ, but as the Greek tongue must have been current in the land, before it would be employed so largely in public inscriptions, they support the conclusion in favour of the prevalence of that language." . . . . "The numismatic evidence is more certain and satisfactory. Not a few Palestinian coins are still extant,

belonging to our Lord's time, and these almost all bear Greek inscriptions."—P. 47.

To this we reply, that the language inscribed on monuments and coins is not, in general, the language spoken by the people, but the language which the fashion or caprice of their rulers sees meet to adopt. The current coin of Judæa, in the days of our Saviour, bore the superscription of Cæsar, because he thereby claimed the supremacy over the country. The Palestinian monuments and coins bear Greek superscriptions, because Herod and his successors were anxious to introduce the customs and manners of Greece. The inscriptions found on Palestinian coins no more show the language of Judea to have been Greek, than the Latin inscriptions on most of the coins that have circulated in Britain prove that the English speak the language of Rome.

Our Lord's appearance before Pilate. In reference to our Lord's appearance before Pilate, Dr Roberts remarks:—"I now proceed to direct the reader's attention to a part of the evangelic history, which bears the clearest and most conclusive testimony to the validity of that position, which it is the object of this work to establish. I refer to those passages, in all the four Gospels, which record the conversations that were carried on between our Lord and Pilate, on the one hand, and between Pilate and the populace, on the other, when the Saviour was brought before him for

judgment. No one will venture to maintain that the Roman governor either understood or employed Hebrew, nor will many be inclined to suppose that Latin was used by our Lord or the Jews in their intercourse with Pilate. The only other supposition is, that *Greek* was the language employed by all the parties in question; unless, indeed, it be assumed that an interpreter was employed between them."—P. 129.

After a somewhat lengthened argument, in order to show the improbability of our Lord's having spoken through an interpreter, the discussion ends with the confident conclusion, "Is it not at once apparent from the narrative, that one tongue was then employed by all the various speakers? And if so, it is not manifest that that could have been no other than the Greek language."

The supposition that Pilate understood and employed Hebrew, which Dr Roberts seems to regard as utterly unworthy of notice, we believe to be the supposition that is best entitled to acceptance.

We have already shown by a variety of arguments, that Hebrew was the language of the country, and that we have reason to believe that the populace of Jerusalem knew but little Greek, while the inhabitants of the rural districts were altogether ignorant of it.

On the other hand, a very little reflection is sufficient to show, that it must have been an object of great importance for the Governor of Judæa to make himself

acquainted with the language of the people over whom he was appointed to rule. When acting as a judge, he must have found it of great advantage to take part in the examination of witnesses. When endeavouring to suppress disturbances, he must often have found a few words spoken in the language of their early youth one of the most effectual means of conciliating angry feeling. A knowledge of the native tongue may, in short, be looked on as essential on the part of a ruler.

The British Government act on this principle when they require the young men sent out to the civil service in India, to act as the future judges of that land, to be all acquainted with one or more of the native tongues. We have reason to believe that a similar rule was followed by the Romans. We read, at least, that some of the governors whom they appointed could not only address men of different nationalities, but were able to converse with the inhabitants of different districts and localities in their appropriate provincial speech. We know how anxious Pilate was to conciliate the Jews, and conclude that nothing could be more natural than to suppose that he had endeavoured to learn their language, in order to secure their good-will.

We, therefore, think it very probable that Hebrew was the language in which the conversation between our Saviour and Pilate was carried on.

But even if we were to suppose that it was Greek that was employed, that would not necessarily imply

that our Lord must have learned that language in his youth. When at Nazareth he stood up to read, some of his hearers exclaimed, "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" Dr Roberts propounds a similar question in regard to the knowledge of Greek which the Apostles possessed, even after they had received the gift of tongues, and were under the guidance of the Holy Spirit—"How could Palestinian Jews, like Peter, James, and John, have written in Greek, unless that were the language which men, even in the humblest station, naturally employed?" Will Dr Roberts speak in a similar manner of Him who knew all things? Will he venture to say, "How could Jesus of Nazareth, if he had not been taught in his youth to speak the language of Greece, have been able to carry on in that tongue a conversation with Pilate?" That, however, is the style of argument he must be prepared to adopt, before he can logically introduce the interview between our Saviour and Pilate as evidence in support of his "position."

We have now examined the principal arguments by which Dr Roberts endeavours to prove that the language of Palestine was Greek. We leave our readers to determine for themselves the weight to which his reasoning is entitled.

CHAPTER IX.

THE GIFT OF TONGUES.—OPINION OF DR ROBERTS AND DEAN ALFORD.

THE gift of tongues is a subject far too important to be adequately discussed as an appendix to our inquiry into the language of the Jews. At the same time, it is so closely connected with that inquiry that we cannot pass it by altogether without notice.

We shall therefore give, in the first place, the views entertained by Dean Alford, and "the great majority of modern scholars," as they are described by Dr Roberts, and thereafter shall very briefly state the reasons which induce us to continue to hold what, it seems, are now regarded as antiquated notions.

Dr Roberts says, in his "Discussions," page 71—"The first question is, How *could* Palestinian Jews, like Peter, James, and John, unlettered and ignorant men—men certainly possessed of no advantages, whether of rank or education, above the respectable labouring classes in Judea,—*have written in Greek*, unless that were the language which men, even in the humblest station, naturally employed? . . . . . There is only

one mode of escaping from the conclusion which follows from the first of these questions. It is implied in the following words of Greswell, in his learned and laborious work upon the Gospels:—'If the Greek alone,' he says, 'would have sufficed everywhere out of Palestine, as the vehicle of a popular address, what necessity for the gift of any other language? And if the Greek was understood even in Palestine, what necessity, even there, for the gift of that?' It is thus supposed, that although Peter and James did not naturally use or understand Greek, they were supernaturally endowed with a knowledge of that language.

"But while this hypothesis of Greswell's certainly removes one class of difficulties, it appears to me to entail on its advocates another class of difficulties not less manifest or formidable. I cannot but agree with those critics who deem the supposition in question equally opposed to reason, ancient testimony, and Scripture. The idea that the Apostles were taught Greek by the immediate interposition of Heaven, seems repugnant to the constitution and working of the human mind, and to all that is told in the Bible as to the manner in which the Spirit of God operates upon it. It has been admitted by the great majority of modern scholars, that such a supposition as that under consideration is utterly opposed to all that we know or can conceive of the mechanism and exercise of the human understanding.

"'I would not conceal,' says Dean Alford, 'the difficulty which our minds find in conceiving a person supernaturally endowed with the power of speaking, ordinarily and consciously, a language which he has never learned. I believe that difficulty to be insuperable. Such an endowment would not only be contrary to the analogy of God's dealings, but, as far as I can see into the matter, self-contradictory, and therefore impossible. But there is no such contradiction, and to my mind no such difficulty, in conceiving a man to be moved to utterance of sounds dictated by the Holy Spirit.'

"Almost all recent expositors agree with the foregoing remarks of Alford, as also with the views which he expresses, when he says, 'If the supposition be made that the gift of speaking in various languages was bestowed on the disciples for their after use in preaching the Gospel, we are, I think, running counter to the whole course of Scripture and early patristic evidence on the subject. There is no trace whatever of such a power being possessed or exercised by the Apostles, or by those who followed them. I believe, therefore, the event related in our text to have been a sudden and powerful inspiration of the Holy Spirit, by which the disciples uttered, not of their own minds, but as mouthpieces of the Spirit, the praises of God in various languages, hitherto, and possibly at the time itself, unknown to them.'" Thus far Dean Alford.

Dr Roberts proceeds to say:—"In a word, the opinion that the Greek, in which the Apostles spoke and wrote, strongly marked as it is by local and individual peculiarities, was directly conveyed to them from Heaven, involves so many difficulties, if it does not even imply utter contradiction, that although held by the great majority of expositors, from Chrysostom downwards, it is now by general consent abandoned."

When we read the statements of Scripture in regard to the gift of tongues, without allowing our thoughts to be distracted by speculations referring to the "mechanism and exercise of the human understanding," or by the ideas which modern scholars have formed of "the analogy of God's dealings," we are unquestionably led to believe that those on whom the power of the Spirit fell were "supernaturally endowed with the power of speaking consciously languages which they had never learned." We cannot say that they possessed this power at all times; but that they possessed it on every occasion when its exercise tended to the welfare of the Church, we have no doubt.

That this is the natural conclusion to which the intelligent perusal of the sacred narrative brings a man of unbiassed mind, is made abundantly evident by the fact, which Dr Roberts himself has stated, that such has been the opinion "held by the great majority of expositors, from Chrysostom downwards."

The work was unquestionably miraculous. It was a

manifestation of the power of God such as we do not see in the ordinary course of his providence. It was a miracle of a very remarkable kind; as such it had been spoken of by our Lord when he told his disciples to remain in Jerusalem until they should be baptised with the Holy Ghost; as such it was spoken of in the Old Testament, when it was referred to as the gift by which the latter days were more especially to be distinguished (Acts ii. 16, Joel ii. 28); and as such it was spoken of by the sacred writers in the New Testament, after the event had occurred.

It was a manifestation of Divine power such as has not been seen either before or since; but we do not conclude, on that account, that it was "self-contradictory, and therefore impossible."

The argument of our modern critics, as stated by Dr Roberts, in so far as we can judge, resolves itself into this:—The idea of men having communicated to them the power of speaking languages which they had never learned is so far opposed to our experience, and to the idea we have formed of the faculties of the human mind, that we cannot understand it, and therefore we cannot believe it. They adopt the same argument that was employed by David Hume and his associates in a former age. The men are very different, their objects are very different; but we see no essential difference between the argument of Dean Alford and the argument of David Hume.

The outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost was a miracle wrought on the mental faculties of men. We have many instances related of miracles wrought on the bodies of men; why should we think it incredible that miracles could be wrought immediately and directly influencing their minds? Were such gifts beyond the power of Omnipotence to bestow, or unsuitable to the circumstances in which they were given?

We farther remark, that in many of the miracles wrought by the Saviour for the removal of bodily evils, there was, at the same time, the instantaneous communication of mental acquirements.

When a man lame from his birth was enabled at once to walk, this implied not only the healing of the bodily infirmity, but the miraculous imparting of the knowledge by which we are enabled to make a right use of our limbs, which in ordinary cases lengthened practice alone can supply. Cases, for instance, have occurred in which prisoners, long confined in chains and narrow cells, were scarcely able, when first set free, to walk at all.

When a man born blind was made to see, there was not only the removal of the bodily imperfection, but the instantaneous imparting of the power by which we judge, from the impressions made on the eye, of the colours, shades, shapes, sizes, and distances of the various objects that are before us. When sight is communicated to persons born blind, by means of a

surgical operation, this power, without which vision would be of little value, is acquired only by slow degrees. In the case of the man born blind, who was made at once to see every man clearly, a work of very remarkable supernatural power was wrought on the mental faculties as well as on the bodily organ.

In the seventh of Mark we are told of a deaf man, who had also an impediment in his speech, whom they brought to Jesus, and after the Saviour had put his fingers into his ears, and prayed, his ears were opened, and the string of his tongue was loosed, and "*he spake plain.*" We have every reason to believe that similar consequences followed in the other instances in which the deaf were healed. We cannot imagine our Lord leaving any of His cures incomplete. When the deaf, therefore, were cured, we conclude that there was not only a defect removed from their bodily frames, but that they had miraculously imparted to their minds a knowledge of the language in which they spake. The gift, in fact, was precisely similar to that which was bestowed on the disciples at the Feast of Pentecost. It differed only in the circumstance that it seems to have been confined to the language of the country in which they dwelt.

We cannot but express our decided dissent from the explanation given by Dean Alford of the work of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. He cannot accept of the old idea, that "the gift of speaking in various

languages was bestowed on the disciples for their after use in preaching the Gospel," but believes it "to have been a sudden inspiration of the Holy Spirit, by which the disciples uttered, not of their own minds, but as mouthpieces of the Spirit, the praises of God in various languages, hitherto, and possibly at the time itself, unknown to them." The power exercised on that day over the disciples, if this explanation is accepted, must have been very like that which was manifested when the dumb beast, speaking with man's voice, reproved the madness of the prophet. We cannot help thinking that the promise of the Saviour, that his Apostles should be endowed with power from on high, implied something more than "a sudden inspiration, not of their own minds," by which they spake "in language possibly at the time itself unknown to them." We cannot help believing that there was an intelligent co-operation with the Spirit, and that a gift was given to be used by them when they saw meet. (1 Cor. xv.)

"A sudden inspiration, not of their own minds, but as mouthpieces of the Spirit," might be a very suitable description of the testimony which the demoniacs bore to the Saviour; but it was certainly something very different that was bestowed on the Apostles on the day of Pentecost.

CONCLUSION.

The second part of our inquiry, in which we direct attention to the language of the Jews, has not equal importance with the first part, in which we endeavoured to determine the true chronology of Scripture, and the authority to which, in rendering the Old Testament, we should more especially defer.

At the same time, it seems to be worthy of consideration, not merely as affording a subject of curious research, but as manifesting the providence of God in the wonderful permanency of the Hebrew tongue. If we be right in our conclusions, that language was preserved from any essential change for the long period of nearly two thousand years. And why was it thus preserved? Because it was the language of the people whom God had chosen to be the depositaries of his revelation, and his witnesses to the nations; and the admiration that is awakened in contemplating this seemingly miraculous perpetuity of speech is farther heightened when we find that it is to be referred, not to the exertion of any mysterious supernatural power, but to the operation of the ordinances given by Moses, and the measures introduced by Nehemiah, acting in

perfect accordance with the general principles which regulate the languago of man in every country and in every age.

In the few remarks which we have made on the gift of tongues, we have directed attention to a subject of great importance. We frankly confess ourselves unable to do it justice, and earnestly hope some abler theologian will take it up.

EDINBURGH: PRINTED BY C. GIBSON, WEST THISTLE STREET.

1 1012 01268 3167